The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1890.

The Week.

THE President has added one more to the list of muzzled newspapers by the appointment of Mr. Charles Emory Smith, editor of the Philadelphia *Press*, to the Russian Mission. It is true that the *Press* had already all the characteristics of a muzzled journal, and in all human probability would never under any provocation have criticised the Administration. But this appointment not only saves it even from all weakness or temptation, but rewards Mr. Smith for past services. Daniel Webster would have condemned the appointment in sonorous language, but we do not. It is a good one for President Harrison—far better than Mr. Thorndike Rice's, which was probably paid for in campaign cash. But—one can praise no act of Gen. Harrison's without the use of a "but" or two—where does this leave Elder Shepard of the *Mail and Express?* He, too, has been a faithful editor to the Administration. He is a powerful writer, and perhaps the foremost publicist in Republican journalism. He is, too, deeply religious, and an evangelist by nature and temperament. The Russians, including the Czar, belong to the Greek Church, and the members of that denomination, we learn from the *Cumberland Presbyterian Review*, are "as destitute of a pure Gospel as the heathen world itself." Now, what a chance of bringing over to the Presbyterian Church at least the Czar and his family, and the aristocracy of St. Petersburg, President Harrison has missed by his failure to despatch Elder Shepard to that corrupt and vicious capital.

Editor Shepard and Gov. Hill are holding a wake over the remains of the World's-Fair Bill, each in his peculiar way. All others are attending the funeral in an orderly manner. The Governor has borrowed the cap and bells from the editor long enough to tell the Legislature that if they will now pass the bill "substantially" as it came from New York city, he will sign it. There is as much latitude in Hill's "substantially" as there is in *Touchstone's* "if." We would advise the Legislature to avoid it. He not only tells them this, but he says *substantially* that if they put the names of the new incorporators into the bill, he will veto it. This is the last nail in the coffin. And then he throws in a whole sermon on the importance of casting aside partisan motives, and the need of taking up the subject in a patriotic spirit. If there is any political capital to be made out of the corpse, the Governor is sure to be the chief mourner. We are still looking for any signs of rejoicing at Chicago and St. Louis over the discomfiture of New York in the competition for the Fair. But, strange it is, the more our chances fade away, the more dim becomes the perspective and the more profound the silence in those quarters. If they want either an editor or a Governor to "keep up the racket," we can spare one of each.

The contributions which Republican leaders are making to the World's-Fair discussion are uncommonly interesting, but not entirely harmonious. Senator Chandler's views easily hold first place both in picturesqueness and originality. He has grave doubts of our ability to get up a World's Fair either in 1892 or 1893, or, in fact, at any other time, because "our high protective tariff is a serious obstacle to exhibitors from abroad," who would be obliged to give heavy bonds either to pay duties on their exhibits or to reëxport them at the close of the Exposition. For this reason he is afraid that we could not get up a Fair which, compared with that recently closed in Paris, would not be disappointing. But what we might do, he says, would be to get up a "United States National Fair" at Chicago, to which foreign countries would be invited, not to bring goods, but to come as spectators "to see how little need we have of foreign goods." This, he is positive, "would overtop all expectations, would be the wonder of the century to foreign visitors and the greatest possible triumph of the protective system." But a World's Fair, even if we could get one, he has reason to fear, would be turned by Tammany "into a free-trade crusade." If Tammany did not do that with it, Mr. Chandler has no doubt whatever that Mayor Grant would use the Fair for political advantage in the Presidential campaign, because he regards the Mayor's act in making the New York city Police Board entirely Democratic the "boldest political wrong of the decade north of Mason and Dixon's line." Mark you, he does not allow himself to be too sweeping. He limits his denunciation to the present decade, and this side of Mason and Dixon's line. He is "amazed" at Mr. Depew and Warner Miller that they have not realized the enormity of the wrong, and insists that no Fair Bill should be passed at Albany which does not contain a provision that the Police Board shall be divided equally between the two parties.

If this addition to the Fair Bill which Mr. Chandler proposes, would not secure a veto in case the measure were passed with it attached, Mr. Depew's latest proposition would be certain to do it. He has a scheme for the addition to the list of Commissioners of as many eminent Republicans as there are Mugwumps now on it, the additional names to be selected by the Mayor and sent to Albany with his approval. Mr. Depew thinks that if the Mayor were to do this, everybody's confidence would be restored, all suspicion of politics in the bill would vanish like dew before the morning sun, and we should have a Fair that would be, to quote Mr. Depew's own words, "the most wonderful thing of the kind the world has ever seen, which will be of incalculable benefit to the city and to the country at large." At this writing there are grave doubts that Mr. Depew's suggestion will be accepted by anybody besides himself. It certainly will not be by Mr. Chandler, because the Police Board reformation is not included. It undoubtedly will be accepted by another Republican leader, Congressman Belden of Syracuse, formerly of the Canal Ring. He says boldly, and with no fear of Chandler before his eyes, that the political aspect of the movement has been absurdly exaggerated, and that his motto is "Anything for the Fair." That has been the motto of all the Fair boomers in these parts for some time, and it is the chief source of all the present complications. It led them to sacrifice first the Central Park, and then the State Constitution, and then the rights of citizens to control their own property. They would have succeeded if they could have swept away the courts, or had the editor of the *Times* been empowered to act during the necessary period as an especial court of last resort, with full authority to revise and correct the judgments of all inferior judicial tribunals. We have not the slightest doubt that he would have accepted the position with alacrity.

Senator Hoar's defence of the removal of the Collector of Boston is, like all that venerable political pettifogger's utterances, chiefly interesting for its calm superiority to anything like a moral obligation in politics. He says:

"The Collectorship of Boston is a political office, the greatest in New England, and its incumbent should be changed with every administration, just as the members of the Cabinet are. The Collector of Boston is the chief representative of the National Administration in New England, and ought to be in political sympathy with it. Then, too, he ought to be a protectionist under a Republican Administration. I would as soon think of getting a pagan to preach the Christian religion as of getting a free-trader to interpret our protective tariff. Again, it was necessary to make this change now, a few weeks before the commission of Collector Saltonstall runs out, because the other Massachusetts appointments depend somewhat upon the chief one. The residence, the age, the civil or military service of the man appointed Collector, must be considered in appointing the Surveyor, the Pension Agent, and the District Attorney. I think Collector Saltonstall should have appreciated this consideration and resigned. There is no question of civil-service reform in this, except to those who do not know the proper limits of that reform."

Plainly stated, this amounts to a confession that the President broke his solemn personal pledge because he wanted a good protectionist for Collector of Boston, in order to secure a basis for getting political possession of other important offices. Mr. Hoar is quite frank and truthful in saying that "there is no question of civil-service reform in this." The full truth in the whole matter was stated in much the same way by one of the Democratic Congressmen from Massachusetts, Mr. O'Neill, who said of the change: "It simply shows how hungry the Republicans are for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

office, and how little there is in this civil-service-reform pretence."

There is a story in Wall Street that the Sugar Trust contributed $100,000 to the Republican campaign fund in 1888, on the promise that the tariff should not be altered to their detriment during the next four years, but that the Republican leaders are now going back on the bargain. If any such bargain was made—and we think that the evidence points that way very strongly—it would be well to go back on it as soon as possible, because it was a very one-sided arrangement, being virtually a bargain to sell the privilege of plucking the American people of several millions per year in return for the beggarly sum of $100,000 cash down. The best authorities on international law uphold the right to denounce a treaty, after a reasonable time, if its terms are found to be oppressive to one of the parties. In this case a reasonable time has passed. One-third of the period has expired, and the Trust has been recouped at least one hundred times over for its campaign subscription. No reasonable complaint can be made if one party now gives notice of termination of the treaty. That such notice has been given, or will shortly be given, we infer from a correspondence between the editor of the Washington (Iowa) *Press* and the Hon. J. H. Gear, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The editor wrote to Mr. Gear urging him to "knock the tariff higher than Gilderoy's kite" so far as it protected any Trust, but especially the Sugar Trust. Mr. Gear replied in a cautious way, but he did say: "I am in favor of largely reducing the differential or discriminating duties which have existed ever since the foundation of our Government between raw and refined sugars." Mr. Gear also said that he "would much prefer to take the tax off the necessaries of life than that on tobacco, as the tobacco tax is purely voluntary with those who use the noxious weed; the same is true of whiskey." Mr. Gear is an important spoke in the tariff wheel just now.

That rather sleepy body the Chamber of Commerce waked up on Thursday to the fact that a bill has passed one branch of Congress the effect of which would be eminently disastrous to the commerce and prosperity of New York. The high-tariff faction made every effort to prevent any action by the Chamber adverse to the bill, but they were beaten, and beaten, too, by the votes of Republican members of the Chamber. What is wanted now is speedy action by the enlarged Committee on Foreign Commerce. This Committee, by the way, seems to have been originally constituted of a majority of men opposed to foreign commerce, on the principle of *lucus a non lucendo*. In its enlarged state—enlarged for the purposes of the McKinley bill—it comes much nearer to expressing the ideas for which such a committee may be supposed to exist.

The report of Mr. Blair's speech on Thursday suggests serious doubts of his sanity. In face of such facts as the quadrupling of the school fund in Texas within the past eight years, and an increase of 2,400 per cent. in the amount expended for school purposes in Arkansas within the past sixteen years, "he doubted whether the conditions were being improved in a single State." Later in his speech he said that "in the North the common-school system was trembling in the balance, if, indeed, it had not already died." Really, a commission *de lunatico inquirendo* seems called for when a United States Senator talks in this way.

Mr. Halstead's testimony before the Senate Committee in regard to his publication of the celebrated ballot-box forgery in Ohio, during the last campaign, was infantile in its frankness. The most inexplicable thing about his conduct has been from the first his failure to see anything suspicious in the presence of the names of Senator Sherman and Congressmen Butterworth and McKinley on a paper which convicted them of being engaged with leading Democrats in a gigantic swindle. Yet on this point he said on Thursday:

"I told the Governor that I felt so exasperated at the idea of Sherman and Butterworth and McKinley going in with John McLean in such a matter that I felt tempted to explode it under them. It was something more than policy and almost a public duty. But Campbell was the only one before the people as a candidate for public office, and it might, therefore, be proper to use only his name. There was another reason why all of the signatures could not be printed in civilized society at that time, and that was because it was the day of Sam Cox's funeral, and I felt convinced of the genuineness of his signature. So I published part of the paper, with Campbell's signature, which I thought was the proper course. Campbell could not be drawn out on this matter, and I advised Gov. Foraker to leave the matter to me, as I felt more competent to take care of it. It was a cracker that had to be touched off at one end only. I am not insensible to the picturesque effect that attaches to this theory, now that I see the general effect of touching it off."

That makes the matter worse than ever. He not only believed the three leading statesmen of his party were capable of taking a hand in a swindle, but he almost felt it a public duty to expose them. When he touched off his cracker at the Democratic end, his fear was, not that he should burn his own fingers, but that the explosion might extend to the Republican end and hurt the party. It is the picturesque aspect of the failure which amuses him now, and he still thinks it was a "proper use" for an editor to make of a document to publish only such parts of it as would injure his political enemies, and hold back those which would equally injure his friends. The "picturesque" side of that kind of journalism is certainly much stronger than the moral one.

One of the humors of the political situation is the fact that the Hartford *Courant* is quoting, in defence of Reed, a speech delivered by J. C. S. Blackburn of Kentucky in the House of Representatives, in the very same discussion in which Joseph R. Hawley delivered a speech demolishing Mr. Blackburn's argument, and insisting that "we are causing no hardship whatever in taking the ground we do against this new rule [giving the Speaker the power to count a quorum], and I think we do no serious wrong to the country at any time when we sit in our seats and decline to vote. If the majority desire to have a bill passed in opposition to our wishes, then let the majority come here and pass it over our heads." In this same speech Gen. Hawley sustained the old system in Congress on the ground that it was in consonance with the methods employed in many Legislatures, and that "the modern State constitutions are all tending in that direction, that a bill shall not be regarded as passed unless an actual majority of the members elected shall vote for it." It would be interesting to know whether the *Courant* considers this drift of modern State constitutions a drift in the wrong direction; and if not, why it would make it easier to pass a bill in Congress than in the Legislature of New York, or New Jersey, or Pennsylvania, or Illinois, or Minnesota, or California.

The plot to give the Louisiana lottery a fresh start in the new State of North Dakota has broken down under the storm of popular disapproval provoked by the passage of the bill in the Senate, and its supporters in the House took refuge on Monday in its indefinite postponement. The State and the nation are thus saved from a threatened disgrace. There is one moral of the incident which should not be lost upon Congress, and that is the folly of haste in erecting Territories into States. The Senate Committee on Territories has decided to report in favor of the admission of Idaho, but the recommendation ought not to be acted upon. With North Dakota controlled by politicians who are capable of such business as this lottery plot, and Montana presenting a spectacle of legislative disorder, the country is in no mood for more new States at present.

The report of the Public Examiner of Minnesota on the affairs of the American Building and Loan Association—one of the so-called "national" concerns—is only what any one conversant with the subject might have expected. The whole matter may be summed up in a nutshell. By means of building and loan associations, managed strictly on the coöperative principle, hundreds of thousands of dollars of savings have been accumulated by men of small means, and thousands of such men have been assisted to own houses of their own in a most economical way. In the coöperative associations the expenses are a trifle (most of the officers serving without salary); and as the loans of each association are made only in its own locality, there is the safest knowledge of the property loaned on. Taking advantage of the success of this system, persons in this and other States have stolen its good name, and appropriated the special statutes passed in regard to it, to organize so-called building and loan associations which spread their business all over the country, and pretend to offer to investors and borrowers the same advantages that the coöperative associations afford, while at the same time incurring heavy expenses for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rentals, clerks, and agents, and admitting (when closely pressed) that they have in view the accumulation of a fund for the profit of the officers. A bill is making progress at Albany which will check in this State the operation of these "national" associations organized in other States. What is wanted in addition is so plain an amendment to our own existing laws that "national" associations organized in this State will no longer be allowed to masquerade under false colors.

Last month an "Afro-American League" held a convention in Chicago, and last week another convention of colored men was held in Washington. Both gatherings proceeded upon the assumption that the men of black skins in the United States should hold themselves a separate class in the citizenship of the nation, and that they may properly demand the enactment of class legislation in their behalf, such as never would be thought of for any other portion of our population. Both gatherings will strengthen the growing resentment against those blind leaders of the blind who are thus organizing an element which constitutes only about an eighth of our inhabitants, in a way which would be thought intolerable if it were proposed by Irish-Americans, or German-Americans, or Italian-Americans, and which is exactly as inadmissible in the case of Afro-Americans. The lesson that the negro needs to master first of all is that which was taught by the Supreme Court of the United States when it annulled the Civil Rights Act, which had been passed in his interest, and declared that the time had come "when he takes the rank of a mere citizen, and ceases to be the special favorite of the laws, and when his rights as a citizen, or a man, are to be protected in the ordinary modes by which other men's rights are protected."

Señor Castelar, the great Spanish orator, has a letter in *Galignani's Messenger* of January 30, in which he discusses the Pan-American Conference and its objects with considerable freedom. He points out that from the very first the Spanish-American republics parted company with their Northern sister on the question of intercourse with the outer world. They chose free trade as their policy, opened their ports to all the world, and on this have built up an enormous foreign commerce, in which they are prospering, and which they thoroughly understand and will on no account surrender. He says:

"In Uruguay, for example, half of its importations come from France and England, while American productions count only an eighth part of the total importations. How can any Customs Union induce Uruguayans to buy exceedingly dear American products when they can get them in abundance and cheaper from Europe? The South American States are not tempted to imitate the Saxon Republic, where an over-abundance of riches has produced a plethora—'the surplus'—and brought the country into the apoplectic condition of the human body when there is an excess of blood coursing through the veins."

He cannot understand how such a positive people as the Americans should have a minister with such "a Utopian and dreamy intelligence" as Mr. Blaine's, and he insinuates that Mr. Blaine dreams of conquest in the guise of commercial union; but nothing can come, he predicts, of any such scheme. He also pleasantly warns us against attaching much importance to the eulogies on our material growth extracted from the Pan-Americans when Mr. Curtis was carting them round the country. "In such Platonic tributes," he says, "no race can excel ours. In the end, both nations will have spoken much, but nothing will have been accomplished." In short, Señor Castelar exposes the folly of a union based on geographical considerations only, and setting at naught differences of race, traditions, language, religion, and economic ideas. Our treatment of Canada brings this folly out all the more glaringly. We refuse to Canadians—men of our own blood, language, and faith, for the most part—the very things we are trying to force on the Spanish Americans, and we flatter ourselves that the Spanish Americans do not see the contrast and ask themselves what it means.

The explanation of it is simple enough to any one familiar with the workings of the protectionist mind. Canada is neglected or repelled under that curious old mediæval delusion that a great nation cannot profitably trade with a small one, because it offers a large market to the wares of the small one, while the small nation offers only a small market to the wares of the large one, and would thus be able to take more "gold out of the country" than the large nation could get back. In the protectionist imagination, all nations trade as nations *en bloc*, like a family, and sell nothing except for "gold," and find out whether they are trading profitably by counting up their "gold" once a month or so. You cannot get the fact that international trade is barter into a protectionist head without a surgical operation. Even the Custom-house returns make no impression on it. It sees "gold" everywhere, and is always trying to get hold of it. Therefore, the protectionist hates to let any one into his market, especially a small dealer, lest he should get away with some of his "gold." If Canadians are allowed to bring their goods over the border, he feels sure they will take nothing back but "gold." But if he can get down with his goods into the great South American markets, he thinks he can make large sales, and get off with the "gold" before the South Americans notice what he is up to. If you ask him how it is that trade between a big State like New York and a small State like Rhode Island is so profitable, he simply gets angry, calls you a "British free-trader" and an "enemy of the Fair."

We can well believe that the German Emperor's rescript to his Minister of Commerce, affirming that "it is the duty of the State to so regulate the duration and the nature of labor as to insure the health, the morality, and the supply of all the economic wants of the workingmen," has caused a great sensation in parliamentary circles. The sensation will not be confined to parliamentary circles, nor will it be confined to the country over which the young Emperor presides. It is, indeed, the most extraordinary step in the direction of socialism that has been taken by any ruler in our time. The despatches say that the rescript was not signed by any responsible Minister. We should presume not, for although Bismarck has gone further than anybody else in authority in carrying out the dogmas of state socialism, he might well pause before putting his name to a paper which holds out the hope that the state will charge itself with the supply of all the economic wants of everybody. In so far as the rescript looks to the gathering of information and to the establishment of rules for the arbitration of disputes between workingmen and their employers, there is nothing unusual or revolutionary in the rescript. France and Belgium have long had tribunals of arbitration, as also has the State of New York. All civilized communities have machinery for collecting information touching the condition of wage-workers. Our bureaus of labor statistics are in this category. But to go beyond these limits, and to become responsible for the support of any class, or seem to, or hold out the hope of becoming so, is a step of the utmost peril, and one which Germany can less easily afford to take than any other government under the sun.

The reasons why Germany in particular cannot afford to take this step are two-fold. One is that she has taken so many already that she cannot easily turn back when she finds herself in the wrong. She has carried state socialism to a dangerous pass. The workingmen's insurance laws, by virtue of which the taxpayers, the employers, and the workingmen jointly contribute an eleemosynary fund, are only one part of the system. The other and most harmful part is that which seeks to build up trade monopolies inside the empire for the benefit of the employing class. Protection, Trusts, and combinations of one sort and another have reached so high a stage of development that logically something must needs be done for the benefit of the employed, and the misery of the situation is, that there is nobody endowed with omniscience to tell where to stop. But there is one person who, although not omniscient, is omnipotent, or nearly so. That one is the Emperor And here we find the second reason why Germany is peculiarly exposed to socialistic disorders. The Emperor's rescript is fraught with perils much graver than any which could assail a parliamentary government, where a ministry is responsible to the people's representatives for every step taken and for every word uttered. There are seeds in it whose germination and fruitage nobody can now forecast. That they are seeds of ill to imperialism itself can scarcely be doubted.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW "ONE-MAN POWER" WORKS.

In his forcible warning on January 28, 1880, against the suggestion of giving the Speaker power to go behind the roll-call and to count a quorum himself, Gen. Garfield said: "I think my friend from Virginia will see that he lets in the one-man power in a far more dangerous way than ever has occurred before in any legislative assembly of which he and I have any knowledge." Later in the same speech he said: "Sir, the moment you get over the line, the moment you cross the boundary of names, the moment you leap over the iron fence of the roll, that moment you are out in the vague, and all sorts of disorders may come in."

After our recent experience of this "one-man power," it is easy to show that Gen. Garfield's impressive protest was well grounded. On Wednesday, January 29, the roll was called on a motion, and resulted in 161 yeas and 2 nays. According to all the precedents since the first Congress was organized, this was a defeat of the motion, inasmuch as no quorum had voted, and this point was immediately raised by a member. But Mr. Reed, without any rules to justify him in exercising such unprecedented power, proceeded to count a quorum himself. The report in the *Congressional Record* reads:

The Speaker—The Chair directs the Clerk to record the following names of members present and refusing to vote: Mr. Blanchard, etc., etc., *Mr. Outhwaite.*

Mr. Outhwaite—I wish to state to the Chair that I was not present in the House when my name was called, and the Chair is therefore stating what is not true. It is not for the Chair to say whether I shall vote or not, or whether I shall answer to my name when it is called.

In the course of the discussion which followed occurred this passage:

Mr. Outhwaite—If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him at that point, I want to state in the presence of this House that the Speaker has announced myself as being present at the time the roll-call was taken, when in fact I was not in my seat. I was not on the floor of the House after the beginning of the calling of the roll until the end of the same, yet I am put upon the record as being present and refusing to vote!

Mr. Crisp—Mr. Speaker, I ask again, in the language of Mr. Garfield, "Who is to control his seeing?" The statement just made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Outhwaite) illustrates at once the force and clearness of the argument of Mr. Garfield when he asks in this debate: "Who is to control his seeing? How do we know but that he may see forty members more for his own purposes than there are in the House? And what protection have gentlemen if the Speaker says he sees a quorum, if he can convert that seeing into a list of names on the call of the roll by the Clerk?"

Before the House adjourned, the Speaker was forced to confess that he had made a mistake in the case of Mr. Outhwaite, attempting to excuse himself on the ground that "his name was pronounced by accident."

On Tuesday, February 4, a vote was taken on a motion, which resulted in 157 yeas, no nays, not voting 172. Less than a quorum had answered to the call of the roll. Thereupon, according to the *Congressional Record*:

The Speaker—In addition to those recorded as present and voting, the Chair desires to announce the following members as present and declining to vote: Mr. Blount, etc., etc., *Mr. Stone of Missouri*, etc., etc. The yeas are 157, the noes none; and there being a constitutional quorum present, the previous question is ordered.

On Wednesday, February 5, after the reading of the journal, Mr. Stone of Missouri rose and said, according to the *Congressional Record:*

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear that portion of the journal read which announces the names of members present and not voting on the last yea-and-nay vote yesterday; but I take it to be the same as appears in the *Record*, and if so, the journal is incorrect. The statement in the *Record* is that I was present and not voting on this last call. As a matter of fact, I was in the northwestern part of the city at the time looking for a house, having recently been burned out.

Again, for the second time within a week, the Speaker had to confess that an error had been made, and that, under the power which he had usurped, he had "for his own purposes," in Gen. Garfield's words, declared present and not voting a man who was at the time in a distant part of the city.

When, fifteen years ago, an Indiana member insisted that the Speaker possessed and should exercise this power of counting a quorum, Mr. Blaine replied for himself that "the Chair never heard of that being done," and added: "He begs to remind the House, whereas that might and doubtless would be true, that there is a quorum in the hall, the very principle enunciated by the gentleman from Indiana has been the foundation probably for the greatest legislative frauds ever committed. Where a quorum, in the judgment of the Chair, has been declared to be present in the House against the result of a roll-call, these proceedings in the different Legislatures have brought scandal on their names." The Outhwaite and Stone incidents are sufficient to show what "legislative frauds" are possible when the Speaker goes behind the roll-call. When such "accidents" as this are possible, under the power which Mr. Reed has usurped, is it not plain that Mr. Blaine was right when he said: "The moment you clothe your Speaker with power to go behind your roll-call and assume that there is a quorum in the hall, why, gentlemen, you stand on the very brink of a volcano"?

Another new rule which has been favorably reported to the House by the Republican members of the Committee on Rules, is one which provides that "no dilatory motion shall be entertained by the Speaker," and proposes to leave it to the discretion of the Speaker to determine what a dilatory motion is. How this would work we can see from the *Congressional Record*, which gives the proceedings in the House on Tuesday, February 4. About the middle of the afternoon a motion to refer a bill to the Committee on the Judiciary having been defeated, Mr. McCreary, a Democratic member from Kentucky, moved that the House adjourn, saying that he understood the Committee on Rules would be able to report the following day. Mr. Reed declined to entertain the motion. What followed is thus given in the *Congressional Record:*

Mr. McCreary—I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The Speaker—The gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. McCreary—My parliamentary inquiry is this: The motion to adjourn having been voted down some time ago, and other business having intervened, if a motion to adjourn is not in order now, when will it be in order?

The Speaker—The Chair desires to say, in response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Kentucky, that ordinarily the motion to adjourn is in order when the changed situation of the House is such as to render it probable the House desires to take that action. But the proceedings to-day have been of the same character as those of preceding days, and it is evident to the Chair that these motions are used for the purpose of obstruction and delay. That being the state of the case, and the ordinary time the House has indicated it is its pleasure to adjourn not having arrived, the Chair feels it is carrying out the wishes of the House in making that ruling.

Mr. McCreary rose.

The Speaker—The Chair has replied to the gentleman.

Mr. McCreary—I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. Springer—He has a right to reply.

The Speaker—There cannot be a question of personal privilege pending at this time, the previous question having been ordered.

Mr. McCreary—I made my motion in good faith. I made the motion to adjourn because it is now nearly four o'clock, and because I heard a member of the Committee on Rules say it was probable the Committee on Rules would be able to report the rules to-morrow.

The Speaker—The gentleman from Kentucky must perceive that is not a question of personal privilege.

Mr. McCreary—I make my statement in response to the statement of the Speaker impugning my motives.

The Speaker—The Chair does not impute motives to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. McCreary—I understand the Chair——

The Speaker—The ruling of the Chair is not a personal ruling. It is not personal to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. McCreary—The Chair imputed to me the making of a dilatory motion, when such was not the case; for my motion to adjourn was made in good faith, and because I believe, under all the circumstances, the House should adjourn.

Half an hour later—nothing having intervened but a call of the roll—according to the *Congressional Record*, Mr. McKinley, a Republican member from Ohio, made the same motion which Mr. McCreary had made, the Speaker entertained it, it was passed, "and accordingly (at four o'clock and sixteen minutes P. M.) the House adjourned."

On Wednesday, February 5, according to the *Congressional Record*, "the House met at twelve o'clock M."; the journal was approved by a yea-and-nay vote, after Mr. Reed had corrected the "accident" in Mr. Stone's case; Mr. McKinley moved that the House adjourn; the Speaker entertained the motion, and it was carried; "and accordingly (at twelve o'clock and forty-two minutes P. M.) the House adjourned." The same Speaker who refused on Tuesday to entertain a Democrat's motion to adjourn "at nearly four o'clock"—upon the ground that "the ordinary time the House has indicated it is its pleasure to adjourn has not arrived"—on Wednesday entertained a Republican's motion to adjourn "at twelve o'clock and forty-two minutes P. M."—more than three hours before "the ordinary time"! This is what "the discretion of the Speaker" means regarding a motion which for a century has been held in order.

The proposed changes in the rules are now under discussion in the House. They are important, radical—we may even say revolutionary—changes in the system under which legislation in Congress has been conducted during the first century of our history. They seem to us changes fraught with danger to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our institutions, because they tend to make our Government a government of men and not of laws, and to give the Speaker a power which resembles that of a dictator too closely to be safe.

POLITICAL BLIND STAGGERS.

THE Washington correspondent of the *Tribune* about ten days ago telegraphed the following account, undoubtedly semi-official, of the theory on which Speaker Reed and his followers have been acting during the late series of parliamentary outrages:

"The country wants results, and doesn't care much in what way they are obtained. Hence it was a mere waste of time to quote Speaker Reed himself or Mr. Blaine, or any precedent in the entire parliamentary history of Congress, against the proposal that a minority shall no longer be able to block public business by acting unlawfully."

This sage deliverance has been widely copied by the Republican press as a complete answer to the criticisms on Speaker Reed's performances, and it has evidently got into the heads of a considerable number of the promoters of the Fair in New York as a justification of their extraordinary bill. But we venture to say a more direct attack on the fundamental principles of free government has never appeared in a French, Russian, or Prussian newspaper. The history of Anglo-Saxon freedom is the history of a prolonged, desperate, heroic, and successful struggle to convince rulers that the way in which results were obtained was far more momentous than the results themselves.

The history of American Government is also the history of successful efforts to stake out the path by which Legislatures shall seek results, and to provide punishment for all aberrations from it. The Federal Constitution, and every State Constitution, are solemn declarations by the people that they consider the way in which results are obtained of infinite importance. This is what is meant by the conclusion to the Massachusetts Bill of Rights, which says, in memorable language, that what it aimed at was "a government of laws and not of men." In no country and in no age has such a confession as the *Tribune* utters on behalf of its employers, that "the country wants results, and doesn't care how they are obtained," meant anything but that the people are tired of freedom and wish to put themselves in charge of a dictator. This is in substance what Cromwell said when he turned the Long Parliament out of doors and put the key in his pocket. It is what Augereau said when he arrested the Corps Législatif on the 18th Fructidor, and what Lucien Bonaparte said when, under his brother's orders, he cleared out the Council of Five Hundred on the 18th Brumaire. In fact, the order to the grenadiers was couched in almost the exact language in which the *Tribune* justifies Speaker Reed's usurpations. They were told that the Council was oppressed by assassins and brigands hired with British gold, and were ordered to rescue the majority from this oppression by clearing the hall. So they charged with fixed bayonets.

This, too, is substantially what Louis Napoleon said when he executed the Coup d'État in 1851. He said the country was tired of debate and obstructions, and wanted results by the quickest means. He accordingly dispersed the legislature and abolished the Republic, and undertook to furnish prompt government out of his own head. To this hour the Bonapartists in France preach the Reed doctrine, and ask for a restoration of the Empire on the ground that there ought to be no restrictions on the will of the majority.

The population of nearly every large city in the Union is to-day nearly one-half composed of persons of foreign origin, who knew nothing of constitutions until they came to this country, and do not yet understand their value. Among them, and besides them, there is a vast body of discontented Socialists, Anarchists, and Nationalists, eager to attack vested rights of every description, and, above all, the rights of property, and turn the American Union into a parcel of phalansteries, each presided over by an absolute Boss To all of these the restraints on the holders of power, created by centuries of sacrifice, and consecrated by the tears and prayers and devotion of many generations, are so much useless lumber, to which they would be glad to put the match to-morrow. What they want is results, and they, most emphatically, do not care how they get them.

In the presence of these facts—for none will deny that they are facts—the openly avowed indifference of the native-born Republicans in Congress not only to the rights of minorities, but to the long-standing precedents restricting the power of majorities, is surely an extraordinary and alarming phenomenon. Hardly less so is the openly avowed indifference of the majority of the New York Legislature to-day, and the promoters of the Fair Bill outside the Legislature, to the restrictions of the State Constitution. Not only do they make no account of the constitutional objections to their scheme, although urged by some of the ablest interpreters of the Constitution in the State, but they do not take the trouble to answer or even discuss them. Their mental condition on this subject is apparently very much like that of a French Jacobin club. They dispose of all opposition by an epithet. They tell everybody who shows them the law of the land, and asks them to respect it, that he is "an enemy of the Fair," and that Citizen Depew says it is all right, and that "the country wants results, and does not care," etc.

What is the worst of all this is, that there can be no reasonable doubt that money, simple cash, is behind both these alarming and even dangerous aberrations from the straight and narrow way of American polity. In Congress, behind Speaker Reed's usurpations lies the unvarnished desire to get a majority that will repay money advances made for electioneering purposes by taxation for the benefit of unsuccessful manufacturers, rendered desperate by the attacks made on the help they already receive from the public Treasury. In New York there is no longer any trace left in the Fair scheme either of honor for Columbus or of rejoicing over his great discovery. It has almost from the first become a Fair in reality as well as in name—that is, a place in which to make large sales of wet and dry goods, and boom real estate, in which the undertakers will be guaranteed against loss by the taxpayers. It is for this we are asked to surrender the most valuable thing we have, that reverence for law, and above all for the organic law, which has made America "the land of liberty" par excellence, and without which we should soon get our "results" from a Dictator ruling through forty-two Satraps.

THE SALTONSTALL CASE.

IN his now famous "hearty prayer" which Gen. Harrison "lifted up" while Senator in 1886, he recognized only two lines of policy which a President might pursue in reference to removals from office. One was the "civil-service policy pure and simple and upon a just basis, allowing men accused to be heard, and deciding against them only upon competent proof and fairly"; and the other was the "frank and bold, if brutal, method of turning men and women out simply for political opinion." Senator Harrison's prayer was: "For God's sake, let us have one or the other!" Since his accession to the Presidency, Gen. Harrison has adopted a third kind, which is unlike either of the two he named, and unlike any which his predecessors have followed. It can best be defined as the exact opposite of the "frank and bold" policy. The President made his first conspicuous use of it in October last, in the case of Gen. Manson, a collector of internal revenue in Indiana. Gen. Manson had been a distinguished soldier in the war, and, we believe, had been a companion of the President in the struggle. But he was a Democrat, his office was wanted, and the President was in great distress of mind about it. He went to Indianapolis, ostensibly to assist at the laying of the corner stone of a soldiers' monument, but Manson's office was on his mind all the time, and he was much troubled because he had to return to Washington without having had a private conference with him about it. Soon after his return he sent the General the following letter:

"Mr. Ransdell informed me that you had said to him that you would address me a letter relieving me of a possible embarrassment connected with a change in the Collector's office held by you, and I have been expecting to hear from you. *I do not wish to make any official request or suggestion to you, but a change cannot much longer be deferred, and my desire has been that it might be made in a way as agreeable to you as possible.* This is the object of this personal note. Please inform me of your purpose."

This was brutal, but it was not "frank and bold." It merely amounted to a personal appeal to an old comrade to help a distressed brother out of a tight place. Put in frank, bold English, it would have read: "I want your place for a Republican who is worrying me beyond endurance for immediate possession of it. I cannot remove you without violating the pledge which I made in my letter of acceptance to make no removals save in the 'interest of the public service.' Now,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as you will have to go anyway, won't you oblige an old friend by resigning, and thus spare him the disagreeable necessity of publicly breaking his promises?" Gen. Manson, for reasons which have not been divulged, acceded to the request, sent on his resignation, and that great problem in statesmanship was rolled from the President's mind. He had succeeded in depriving an old soldier and a faithful official of his office, and there could be no clamor about it, since the man had resigned. What mattered it if a little later the correspondence in the transaction got into the newspapers, compelling a former supporter, who had voted for Gen. Harrison because he believed he would be a better civil-service reformer than Cleveland, to exclaim: "The President appears at his littlest in this transaction, and few Presidents have done littler things. He is the President of sixty millions of people, and yet he carries about in his mind, on the most solemn occasions, the edging of an efficient officer out of his place."

Publicity does not appear to have convinced the President of the unwisdom of his new policy, for the correspondence in relation to the Boston Collectorship, published on Friday, shows that he made use of it again there. He has been badgered for months by the two Massachusetts Senators, Messrs. Dawes and Hoar, to remove Mr. Saltonstall before the end of his term, and to appoint Mr. Beard in his place. Mr. Saltonstall was a most efficient officer, who had given entire satisfaction to men of all parties. His term was to expire on May 5 next, and, outside the machine politicians of the party, there were no Republicans who favored his removal before that time. But Messrs. Dawes and Hoar kept on impressing the mind of the President with the need of immediate change. They convinced him early in January that he must not any longer allow his pledges to stand in the way, but they failed to convince him that the "frank and bold, if brutal," course would be the best one to pursue. He tried the opposite, or Indiana one, again, but even less directly this time than before, for he persuaded Secretary Windom to join him in the experiment. The Secretary sent the following letter to Mr. Saltonstall on January 17:

"MY DEAR SIR: The President is ready to make a change in the Collectorship at Boston, but would be glad to do so in a way that would be most agreeable to you."

It will be seen that the phraseology of this precious missive is almost identical with that of the Manson letter. The President is desirous in both to make the process of decapitation as "agreeable" to the victim as possible, in order that it may at the same time be less discreditable to himself. Mr. Saltonstall was less obliging than Gen. Manson had been. He put the matter straight before the minds of the President and his Secretary by sending a very "frank and bold" reply, containing the following reasons for declining to accept the proposition:

"In reply, I beg to say that, placing entire confidence in the declaration of the President concerning tenure of office, I am prepared to serve the term of four years for which I was commissioned on the 5th of May, 1886, unless removed by the authority of the President for such cause as he has announced to be controlling in such cases. If such cause exists, I respectfully request to be informed of the same.

"In the conduct of this office I have endeavored to perform its important duties with fidelity to the Government, in a manner satisfactory to the merchants of Boston, and to conform to the spirit as well as the letter of the civil-service laws. I therefore cannot stultify myself by any act which would imply the consciousness of dereliction on my part, and prefer to leave the decision of this matter in the hands of the President, to whom I forward a copy of the letter."

The President's reply to this reached the ears of Mr. Saltonstall first in the form of an announcement of the appointment of his successor. Having no "cause" to give for the removal, and having no longer any possibility of accomplishing that object by indirect and secret means, he boldly took the ground of an open violation of his pledge and made the change for political reasons only. There has been a faint pretence in one of the disreputable Republican organs of Boston that a cause did exist, in an alleged inability of Mr. Saltonstall to give his personal attention to the duties of his office, but this was promptly disposed of by another Republican organ, the Boston *Advertiser*, which said on January 22:

"The Collector, in fact, has been remarkably attentive and punctual to his duties at the Custom-house. The talk about his neglecting the duties of his office is simply an excuse, and a very poor one at that, to induce the President to remove him. This is not civil-service reform, nor even fair treatment, and we do not think it will avail."

But this "poor excuse" has availed, and we have the word of the most orthodox Republican organ of New England that in yielding to it the President has taken a step that is "not civil-service reform, nor even fair treatment." Upon that point there can, therefore, be no further discussion. But what have the Republicans of Massachusetts and New England to say of a President who devotes his time to such petty ends and accomplishes them by such means? What have they to say to their two Senators who persuade him into taking such a course? The whole of New England is on the brink of a political revolution because of the failure of the Republican Congress to hear the demands of her manufacturers for relief from oppressive tariff exactions. The petition of one branch of them, the iron and steel-workers, has been signed by 150 names of firms, many of which are the most powerful in their several States, praying for such a breaking down of tariff walls as will save their industry from destruction. Yet Messrs. Hoar and Dawes cannot spare time to listen to these calls upon them to devote themselves to one of the highest duties of statesmanship, the making and shaping of wise and salutary economic laws. The President has no time or thought to give to such an exercise of the functions of his office as to counsel Congress to heed these cries. But the three together give up weeks and months to considering the best means by which to grab an office, decide at first to try to gain possession of it by stealth, and, when that fails, seize it in defiance of personal and party pledges, thus obtaining by methods which cause public scandal an office which would have dropped into their hands in the natural course of events only three months later.

COURTS, TAXES, AND SPOILS.

IF all the lawyers assembled in this city on Tuesday last to celebrate the organization of the Supreme Federal Court one hundred years ago had been in sympathy with the McKinley bill, and with Allison, Aldrich, and Beck, who, as a Senate Committee, devised and vindicated that measure in the Senate, some of the speeches on Tuesday week would have been exquisitely droll. Those who uphold that bill, contend that Congress can exclude the judicial power from jurisdiction of any common-law suit whereby the Federal courts can interpret a tariff law or can say that its execution by the Executive has not been what the law has commanded. If Congress can thus exclude the judicial power when the property of the citizen is to be taken by taxes, why not when his property is to be taken under any of the other powers committed to Congress by the Constitution? All agree that a citizen cannot be "deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

Protectionists insist that Congress can levy and collect any taxes, duties, imposts, and excises which, in its opinion, the "general welfare" requires, and the judicial power cannot revise the opinion of Congress in regard to the taxing which the "general welfare" requires. Concede all that; but is a taxing enactment "due process of law" which excludes the citizen, required to pay a tax thereunder, from contesting in court the right of the Executive to collect, under that taxing law, the whole sum demanded? It would be inconvenient and intolerable for the judicial power to be permitted to stop, *by injunction*, the collection of a tax which has the color of law, but can Congress prevent the Federal courts from inquiring, by any sort of a suit, after the collection has been enforced, whether or not the Executive has obeyed the law? Can Congress enact that, under certain circumstances, the Executive shall have power to imprison an importer of consigned goods, and the judicial power shall not have power to try the question whether or not the Executive has obeyed the law?

It will not avail to make moot-court discussions over the power of Congress to prevent a taxpayer from suing a Federal tax-gatherer, however illegal the conduct of the latter. The Constitution does not impart jurisdiction to the Federal courts in the absence of a Congressional mandate, excepting in the single case of suits "affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party." Congress can prescribe the only cases in which the Supreme Court can exercise appellate jurisdiction. The "inferior courts" have no jurisdiction whatever over any case till Congress gives it. Only the Federal circuit courts have now by law jurisdiction of suits by taxpayers against Federal tax-gatherers. Congress can take it all away, and the protectionists have shown

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they will, when "protection" demands it. The Federal courts are really very weak as against Congress, and in restraining Congress from doing whatever bad thing it wishes to do, provided the doing of the thing is not peremptorily forbidden by the Constitution.

The original Constitution says nothing about jury trials excepting for crimes. Only the severe condemnation of the omission secured the seventh amendment, which the McKinley bill evades and nullifies by refusing to taxpayers a suit "at common law," in which alone a jury is required. How Senator Beck could have tolerated it is inexplicable. On the theory of the McKinley bill, the law can empower such executive officers as collectors of ports and general appraisers to fine importers and imprison them for something said to have been done in making an entry of merchandise, and put the inculpated merchants beyond the protection of the courts. And yet, while all this is going on, or threatened, in Congress, Democrats and tariff-reformers are mute; or, if not dumb, they protest feebly, or, what is still more incomprehensible, vote for the measures.

Apart from the existence of a power in Congress to do what the McKinley bill proposes, why should Congress seek to exclude its own courts from trying, according to the common law, the question whether or not the Executive has taken more money as taxes than Congress authorized? And, especially, why, if our Supreme Court really be what we were last week told that it is? Who has seen an answer to that inquiry? What are the motive and purpose inspiring Windom, McKinley, Allison, Aldrich, Beck, the Senate, and the House? They cannot deny that the Executive has recently collected illegal rates and sums. The six-million case confronts them. In the House the other day, Carlisle and McKinley each confessed, when proposing an immediate amendment of the hat-trimmings law, that the Treasury had levied taxes not permitted by Congress. Is it not odd that straightway Congress goes to work to prevent the judicial power from trying any more similar questions? Why do so if our Supreme Court is really, as ex-President Cleveland said, the "light" of our Federal system and our Federal world? What is behind the effort?

We have read the recent House debate—a most inadequate debate it was—on the McKinley bill in order to discover; but in vain. Levying ad-valorem rates consists of identifying the article by the *name* Congress has prescribed, appraising its *value*, fixing its *classification* in the tariff, ascertaining and applying the lawful *rate*, and figuring out the total tax. It was said that as Congress had always excluded the judicial power from meddling with value, so it could and should with name, classification, rate, and sum. The inference is illogical and not compulsory. No one asks for a judicial meddling with values. And why does the McKinley bill give the courts a limited power over *rates*, and no power at all over names, classifications, sums, and the *facts* on which they depend? If the Executive says woollen is worsted, or silver ore is lead ore, or, as Mr. Edmunds put it, a horse is a cow, why now exclude courts and juries from trying the question as they have for a hundred years? What, we repeat, is behind this concerted effort? Cannot Congress trust its own courts? Is Congress afraid of jurymen? Will the protective system be destroyed if the people, as jurors, are permitted to intervene between tax-gatherers and taxpayers? How droll it all is!

The real underlying motive and purpose we fancy to be these:

The Republican protectionists have now the President and the House. The Republicans think they have the Senate for the next decade. Amendment of the law of 1883, in the interest of higher rates, may be of questionable expediency, but the McKinley bill, once on the statute-book, cannot, as the protectionists believe, be repealed while the Senate is Republican. That bill, if law, will enable the Executive, by its power over the nine new appraisers, to classify imported articles in defiance of the courts, and so, in effect, change rates. No new legislation will be needed to carry out the behests of the manufacturers. A Democratic President can, to be sure, turn out the nine appraisers in 1893, but the Republican Senate could refuse to confirm their successors. The whole taxing business of the nation, the levying of more than $300,000,000 a year, will then swell the scandals of the spoils system and the protective system.

COMPROMISE IN THEOLOGY.

THE most surprising thing about the doctrinal dissensions into which the Presbyterian Church has fallen is the suddenness and unexpectedness of their precipitation. There has long been, it is true, sporadic and unconcerted talk within the Church about the need of revising the creed, but there was no premonition of the present agitation in that. When the matter came up before the General Assembly last May, it was thought to have been shelved deftly by a reference to the presbyteries; at any rate, no one but the professional alarmists pretended to foresee the theological disputes which have followed. The leading Presbyterian divines and newspapers kept on with their customary complacent allusions to the doctrinal solidarity of their Church, and the security it was certain to enjoy from the theological innovations which were troubling others. It is only within three months that the Presbyterian Church has waked up to find itself almost torn in two. Such a result has really been inevitable, we can now see, ever since 1869. The reunion of the two branches of the Church effected in that year was a marriage of incompatibles. Neither old-school men nor new-school men abated their antagonistic views a particle at the time of union. They simply agreed not to fight each other openly any more. They thought they had devised a scheme of doctrinal comprehension broad enough to reconcile opinions which in reality never can be reconciled. Men who cling blindly to the past may, indeed, agree to unite for certain ends with men who have the modern spirit, but such a union must be at the sacrifice of theological conviction and consistency, or else it must prove to be simply a patched-up truce, which open war will be certain to break through as soon as an exciting cause appears.

What is perfectly clear now, has all along been evident to the discerning—that old-school and new-school theologies were only mechanically mixed, not fused. The distinctions have been steadily kept up. Certain presbyteries in the reunited Church have been jealously trained in the old-school tradition and certain others in the new. The case has been similar with theological seminaries, religious newspapers, and elective officers of the various church organizations. The unity all along has been hollow. There has been no real uniformity. Pastors are prominent and honored in New York city who would have been tried for heresy if they had been settled in Pittsburgh, and if they had ventured to preach and publish there as they have done here. If Prof. Briggs were under the jurisdiction of a Philadelphia presbytery, or were a member of the Princeton Faculty, everybody knows—for it has been frankly declared by responsible Church authorities—that his trial for heresy would have come off long ago.

For what ends, then, was this union of theological opposites brought about, and for what ends has it thus far been maintained? Why, in reality, for the sake of material prosperity. It was to make the denomination numerically stronger; to enable it to build more and more costly churches; to prevent the waste of money involved in covering the same field with two branches of the same church; to provide for a more active sectarian propaganda in the West and in New England—in short, to give the Church greater prestige in the eyes of the world. That this is a true description of the facts is shown by the tone adopted now by those who fear a dissolution of the union. They speak of the great prosperity of Zion under the united Church. They refer to the vast property interests now at stake, and deprecate scission, not because it will unsettle faith, but because it will unsettle titles. No voice is heard to speak of any theological advantages that have accrued, of any incitement to profound investigation, of any broadening of knowledge and charity, of any real simplification or unifying of the belief of the Church at large.

The result shows that theological compromises are as dangerous and as fruitful mothers of evil as are political compromises. It proves once again that antagonistic convictions cannot come permanently together on the basis of a mere sentiment. Let us waive our theological differences, said the men who brought about the union of 1869, and unite for practical Christian work. The Puritans knew better than to believe such a thing possible. They were not very lovely, but they were very logical when they said, "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" and carried out that principle to minute shades of theological opinion. Waiving theological differences is only another name for mental reservations, non-natural interpretations of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creeds, ambiguous subscription, and all that miserable feeling of being in a false position, so much of which has been revealed in the current debates.

It is instructive to contrast the history of the Congregational Church, during the last twenty years, with that of the Presbyterian. The former has had its sharp theological discussions. It has seemed at times to be on the verge of disruption. But everything has been all the while open and in the light of day. Innovators have been heard, not suppressed. It has not been thought more important to keep up the rate of yearly ecclesiastical enlargement than to maintain the rights of free investigation and free speech. Meanwhile, the Presbyterian Church has been looking down from its secure fortress upon the troubles of its Congregational friends, devoutly thanking God that it was not as they, and boasting of its inaccessibility to change. Now that the occasion has come, the world sees a generation of Presbyterian laymen educated in ignorance of the real creed of the Church, and revolting at it, and Presbyterian elders and ministers who have gone through the form of subscribing to it, and promising to teach it, now in great numbers repudiating its most characteristic tenets. It appears thus that to check a theological debate really bound to come in the end, is like checking the measles: the disease simply takes a more acute and dangerous turn.

There is warning in all this for those who are given to the great schemes of comprehensive church union, so much in vogue today. If churches can be brought to confess that their inherited theologies are too cumbrous armor for modern warfare, to drop them each for itself, and to make the basis of membership in the separate denominations merely a desire to do all the good possible, then there is hope that the separate denominations can be brought into a union on the basis of desiring to do all the good possible. But if theology really has any vitality, it will not long be kept down by sentiment. Sentimental union without theological union simply leads to mutual distrust, uneasy consciences, and final rupture.

POSITIVIST CHURCHES IN LONDON.

LONDON, January, 1890.

MR. FREDERIC HARRISON'S New Year's address before the Positivist Society in Newton Hall, Fetter Lane, has led to a very pretty war of words. The *Times* of January 2 published a condensed report of the address, and then devoted a leading article, a column long, to pouring contempt on Mr. Harrison and all his works. Mr. Harrison at once sent a brief letter to the *Times*, pointing out that its report of his address was "incorrect," and "entirely altered the sense of much that he said." Nevertheless, the *Spectator* followed up the *Times's* attack with two bitter paragraphs, founded entirely on the report to which Mr. Harrison had already taken exception. This drew from Mr. Harrison a savage article which appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette*. "Of all actual journals but one," he says, "the *Spectator* is the most untruthful in matters of fact." And of the *Times's* attack on him he asserts:

"I was fully prepared for it, for I knew the rancor of which I am the object for the part that I took in enforcing the lesson of the Pigott forgeries. I am content to leave all decent and honorable men to judge between me and them. And I warn them, to begin with, that the paymasters of Pigott deliberately publish to the world as his 'own words,' in inverted commas, words that a public speaker did not utter, and then proceed to palm off upon him a phrase which is a mere invention of the reporter."

It occurs to me that the echoes of this controversy having probably reached America, there may be some of your readers who, though perfectly familiar with the Positivist doctrine and with the names and writings of its English champions, may yet be quite in the dark as to Newton Hall and the goings-on in that sanctum-sanctorum of Positivists; and that others of your readers may even be surprised to know that there is a sufficient body of "professing" Positivists to require a hall for public worship; for, according to my observation, the Oxford Don is by no means alone in his opinion who described the Positivist movement as consisting of "three persons and no God."

The truth of the matter seems to be, however, that Positivism has been making considerable progress in England during recent years. At present there are at least three places in London alone where followers of Comte come together to celebrate the glories of Humanity, viz., the Church of Humanity, whose High Priest is Dr. Congreve; Newton Hall, already referred to, where Mr. Frederic Harrison and Prof. Beesly are the presiding spirits, and the meeting-place of the recently organized North London Positivist Society. This North London Society is an offshoot of the Newton Hall Society, and, being in direct sympathy with it, needs no further special mention. But, as regards the Church of Humanity and Newton Hall, it must be noted at once that they represent two different schools of Positivist doctrine and practice, and that there is already, to quote Mr. Harrison's own piquant phrase, "a definite bifurcation in those who profess the religion of Humanity."

On the one hand, there are those who hold with Dr. Congreve to the genuine original Comtean ceremonial, and who "insist on putting into practice the entire scheme of Comte textually and immediately"; and, on the other hand, there are certain more moderate and less ecclesiastical spirits, likely Mr. Harrison and Prof. Beesly, who shrink from going the whole length of the Comtean ritual, and regard the development of strong social sympathies and the cultivation of the intellect as the immediate duties of good Positivists. The profane outsider cannot but suspect that the repudiation of High-Church Comtean ritual by these latter Positivists is due rather to their keener sense of the ridiculous than to any other reason. But, however this may be, the judgment of the non-ritualists seems sanctioned by the result: the Newton Hall school of Positivism certainly has a far larger following than the Church of Humanity. It is also more closely in harmony with the French Positivist Society and with the teachings of the present "Chief of Positivists," M. Lafitte. Accordingly, this letter will henceforth concern itself solely with the Newton Hall branch of Positivism.

The situation of Newton Hall in Fleur-de-Lis Court, Fetter Lane, is, despite the romantic name, distinctly unfortunate, and its exterior uninviting. But once you have toiled up the narrow flight of steps and entered the sacred precincts, you forget the unpleasant approach, and realize that you are in an atmosphere where the highest intellectual ideals reign. The walls of the chapel-like Hall are adorned with busts of the greatest philosophers, statesmen, and poets of all ages. Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Julius Cæsar, Charlemagne, Shakspere, Descartes are kept continually before the eyes of Positivists to remind them of the debt Humanity owes to its men of genius. In one corner of the Hall stands a small pipe-organ; to the right of this and behind what we may perhaps call the lectern, hangs a fine reproduction of Raphael's Sistine Madonna, which at this time of the year is surrounded with a beautiful double wreath of white flowers and evergreens. Various legends from the works of Auguste Comte are inscribed on the walls: "Live Openly," "Live for Others," "The Foundation, Order," "The Principle, Love," "The End, Progress," "Family," "Country" "Humanity."

The regular weekly meeting of the Positivists is held each Sunday afternoon from October to May inclusive. The meetings are open to the public, and there is usually a good sprinkling of strangers present; but the main body of the audience is made up of regular members of the Positivist Society. The exercises begin with the singing of a hymn; a very respectable choir of perhaps a score of young people musters behind the lectern and has been drilled into a fair degree of efficiency. Loose sheets of paper containing the hymn are distributed through the audience, Positivist poetry not yet having assumed sufficient proportions to justify a hymnal. Some of the hymns have been fashioned, by dint of judicious alterations, out of old hymns by Anglican or Unitarian authors —Unitarians preferred; others are the direct offspring of the Positivist muse. They are all marked by a certain constraint; "Humanity" is rarely brought fairly and squarely into the metre, but is usually darkly referred to as a "sacred presence" or a "holy influence." After the hymn there follows a reading from the "Hebrew Scriptures" or some other accredited sacred book; and then the main discourse of the day is pronounced. This discourse is a lecture rather than a sermon—scientific, not ethical or hortatory. The topics discussed are ordinarily historical, the general aim being to get a clear understanding of the various stages through which the spirit of a great and glorious Humanity has had to pass on its way to its present altitudes. During November a course of four lectures was delivered on "The Age of Dante." The lectures for the present month are on "Irish History." During February Mr. Harrison will discuss "Some Great Books of History," and will sketch "A Scheme of Historical Reading"; and during March Mr. Henry Ellis will consider four "Types of Historical Theory"—(1) The Theological: *Bossuet;* (2) The Revolutionary: *Condorcet;* (3) The Theologico-Utilitarian: *De Maistre;* and ("the diapason closing full in man") (4) The Positive: *Auguste Comte.* (It may be noted, by the way, that your true Positivist never says simply *Comte*, the nasal monosyllable being quite insufficient to express his veneration for the great master: the full name *Auguste Comte* is always used.) Occasionally theoretical discourses on the nature and significance of the great movement in which Positivists are engaged, take the place of purely historical dissertations. During December, for example, Mr. Harrison gave four lectures entitled, "The New Era," "The Conception of Humanity," "Are Positivists Socialists?" "Are Positivists Democrats?" Such, then, are the subjects on which the Positivist lecturer discourses each Sunday afternoon for perhaps three-quarters of an hour. At the end of the lecture a second hymn is sung, and the meeting breaks up.

These Sunday meetings, however, by no means exhaust the activity of the Positivist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Society. Believing that their work must for the present be largely educational, they are carrying on several evening classes for the study of various subjects: there are, for example, two French classes, one advanced and one elementary, which meet once a week under the direction of a competent instructor; and once a month an additional meeting is held for the purpose of reading a French play. The Society also comes together once a month, under the presidency of Prof. Beesly, for the discussion of social and political questions; and there is finally a monthly meeting of a purely social character, which is enlivened, like similar gatherings among unenlightened Churchmen, by amateur music, etc., etc.

In addition to the main Positivist organization, there have recently been started a guild of women and a guild of youths; and as a further proof of the success of the Positivist propaganda, Mr. Harrison points to the fact that branch Positivist societies have recently been formed in the north of London and in Manchester.

One important series of the Society's "functions" still remains to be mentioned—their pilgrimages to spots especially associated with memorable men or memorable events in history. A year ago the Society went *en masse* to Horton, where Milton lived after leaving Cambridge, and where "L'Allegro," "Il Penseroso," and "Comus" were composed. In the year just passed, the Society, to quote Mr. Harrison's own words, "has made pilgrimages to the tomb of Thomas à Becket and to Westminster Abbey, and visits to the British Museum and the National Gallery. On all these occasions addresses have been delivered. But, above all, the Society has had a successful and brilliant visit to Paris." It is understood that this visit to Paris was the occasion of a genuine Positivist love-feast between the followers of M. Lafitte and those of Mr. Harrison; and that English as she is spoke and French of Stratford-atte-Bowe were taxed to the utmost for expressions of mutual esteem and of reverence for Auguste Comte.

Now, all this will seem to the ordinary observer ludicrously far from justifying Mr. Harrison's recent boast, that "the conception of Humanity . . . holds in its grasp the future of the world." But, on the other hand, any one who keeps the run of Positivist literature, and follows at all closely the various forms which Positivist activity is taking, must admit that Positivists, however wrong-headed, are thoroughly sincere and thoroughly in earnest; and that their propaganda has been making progress during the last few years. Those who care to keep track of movements of this kind, and who watch with interest, though from a distance, the development of intellectual tendencies in England, may, perhaps, be glad of these details as to the present state of Positivism.

LEWIS E. GATES.

THE DIAMOND NECKLACE.

PARIS, January 23, 1890.

M. CHAIX D'EST-ANGE was one of the leading lawyers under the second empire. The lawyer leaves little behind him, and his eloquence exhausts itself without leaving any trace in literature. The son of M. Chaix d'Est-Ange also followed the law, but he devoted himself at the same time to historical studies. He died young, and his son has just published a volume which the father had prepared on Marie Antoinette. The book has two parts: the first is devoted to the famous trial of the diamond necklace; the second is the trial of the Queen herself before the Revolutionary tribunal.

Carlyle has spoken with his usual originality of the first trial; he has well described the effects produced by its scandalous revelation, and measured their terrible consequences. Royalty received a terrible and unmerited blow in this drama, which had for its principal actors a Prince of the Church, Cardinal de Rohan; Cagliostro the adventurer; a profligate woman, Mme. de Lamotte, and her miserable husband; a prostitute, Mlle. d'Oliva, and some other actors, now entirely forgotten. Even in these years 1784–'85, after Voltairianism had had all its effects, Prince Louis de Rohan, Cardinal, Grand Almoner, Bishop of Strasbourg, Prince of the Empire, scandalized everybody by his mode of life and his immorality. Madame de Genlis said of him in her memoirs: "He was nothing of what he ought to have been." Louis XVI., who was an honest man, disliked him. Marie Antoinette, though she has been described in the pamphlets of the Revolution as frivolous and fond of easy pleasures, had for Cardinal de Rohan an extraordinary aversion, mixed with contempt. She did not try to conceal these sentiments, and she signified her resolution never to receive him. Was there any secret reason for this dislike? Madame Campan says that Cardinal Rohan had criticised at Vienna the manners of Marie Antoinette, after she had married the Dauphin, and had spoken harshly of her, making himself in this the echo of the courtiers, who thought that the young Austrian Princess was too impatient of etiquette and too much given to favoritism. The Queen's aversion to the Cardinal became a sort of torture for Rohan. His intellect was narrow, his passions were obstinate. He conceived a mad passion for the Queen (who despised him) because she despised him; and he thought of nothing but of finding the means to change her sentiment, and turn her aversion into an indulgence which, by degrees, might become an even warmer feeling.

It is incredible that a Prince of the Church should have conceived such a project; much more incredible are the means to which he resorted. The association of a Cardinal with a charlatan like Cagliostro was the first scandal. The acquaintance was made at Saverne, in Alsace, where Rohan built a fine castle, which is now used as a barrack. Part of my childhood was spent in Saverne, one of the loveliest places at the foot of the Vosges Mountains; the Cardinal's château was my Versailles. I vaguely remember terrible stories which were told about the Cardinal, his prodigality, his disorders—stories which, as a child, I could not well understand. The Cardinal brought Cagliostro to Paris, and introduced him into society. At the beginning of 1785, Cagliostro gave himself out as an alchemist and a magician; he said to some that he was born at the time of the deluge, to others that he was one of the guests at the marriage at Cana—he had the secret of prolonging life indefinitely.

The memoirs of Beugnot, which are among the most interesting of our time, give us curious details on another actor in the drama. Madame de Lamotte pretended to descend from a natural son of Henri II., and she had some of the Valois blood in her veins. She was married, but was the mistress of a rake, called Villette, whom Beugnot calls "le Philinte des escrocs." The intrigues which ended in the trial of the diamond necklace are well known: Madame Campan, Beugnot, all the memoirs of the time have told us how M. and Madame de Lamotte and Villette worked upon the passion which Cardinal de Rohan felt for the Queen; how they arranged an interview between him and Mlle. Oliva, in the night, in the gardens of Versailles, and profited by the great likeness between Marie Antoinette and this complaisant young woman; how the Cardinal was made to put large sums of money for the Queen's charities into the hands of Madame de Lamotte; how he finally bought for the Queen a diamond necklace which the Queen had repeatedly refused to buy from the crown jeweller, on account of the price; how Madame de Lamotte, her lover, and her friends disposed of the diamonds for their own use. Though much has been written on the subject, nobody knows exactly at this time what became of the beautiful stones of the necklace; we know the design of it, but nothing more.

M. Chaix d'Est-Ange used the official documents concerning the trial in the National Archives. The Revolution, the Empire respected them, from the first acts of the judicial proceedings to the Parlement's *arrêt*. M. Campardon had already used these documents, and even given their complete text. M. Chaix d'Est-Ange in reality only gives a résumé of his work. He shows also, with great force, how unjust a corrupt public opinion was towards the Queen, who was as innocent of the evil designs of Madame de Lamotte and her associates, and as ignorant, as a new-born babe. But was she not a foreigner—*l'Autrichienne?* Was not every weapon good enough against her? Were not the revolutionary feelings which were already predominant in Paris, ready to seize any pretence, any opportunity? Did not Beaumarchais say, in his "Mariage de Figaro," "Calumniate, calumniate! Some of it will always stick"?

Curiously enough, some sympathy was felt for the Cardinal, and he was considered to have been too harshly treated because he was for a time sent to the Bastille. The trial took place before the Parlement of Paris, and for sixty years the Court and the Parlement had been at war. Chancellor Maupeou had tried in vain to establish new courts of justice; when Louis XVI. ascended the throne, the Parlement was reëstablished, with all its privileges, by Maurepas. The magistrates, embittered by persecution, had become almost hostile to the State and to the Crown. The Prince de Ligne, in his 'Historical Notes on the French Revolution,' said: "It was the fashion to disobey Louis XVI. as much as it was the custom to obey with trembling Cardinal Richelieu, and the magistrates plumed themselves, in the evening, in society, on any impertinence they had offered during the day to royalty." The trial was conducted without reference to the dignity and majesty of the Crown, in a hostile spirit. The Cardinal was acquitted, and his acquittal was received all over Paris with a mad enthusiasm. When he went back to his palace, the *dames de la halle* brought him a bouquet; he showed himself on the balcony to the people, with Cagliostro beside him. It was, indeed, the prologue of the Revolution. Mirabeau wrote on June 1, 1786 ('Memoirs of Mirabeau'): "Thirty years ago, the Cardinal would have been lost without any resource."

Marie Antoinette felt bitterly the insult. Mme. Campan tells us in her memoirs that the Queen said to her: "Condole with me. The intriguer who tried to ruin me, or to procure money by using my name, has been fully acquitted. But," added she, with energy, "you must also, as a French woman, receive my condolence." To her friend Mme. de Polignac she wrote: "Come and weep with me. The judgment which has just been pronounced is a horrible insult. What ingratitude! But I will triumph over the wicked by doing three times as much good as I have always tried to do." She did not triumph over the wicked. Louis XVI. was indignant at the Parlement;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he asked Cardinal de Rohan to resign his charge of Grand Almoner, and to go to one of his abbeys, the Chaise-Dieu in Auvergne.

Mme. de Lamotte was thrown into prison, but she contrived six months afterwards to escape from La Salpétrière. Some people dared to say that Marie Antoinette helped her away, and denounced it as a proof of complicity. But surely if Marie Antoinette had been guilty of any connivance with Mme. de Lamotte, she would have preferred to have her die in a prison, where she had no communication with the outside world, than to see her at large, in London, where Mme. de Lamotte joined her infamous husband and wrote libels against the Queen. This wicked woman never returned to France (though Mirabeau asserted once that she had made her appearance in Paris at the end of 1789). She lived in misery in London, changed her name, and history loses trace of her. Quérard, in his 'Supercheries Littéraires,' says that she committed suicide. M. de Lamotte lived in London on the money he procured from the necklace, which had been pawned, in 1783, at a jeweller's named Gray. We find him in Paris during the massacres of September, borne in triumph by the assassins. He only died in 1831; towards the end of his life he was in a state of great misery.

Cagliostro was banished by the King and retired to London. He travelled in Switzerland and Italy, and had the impudence to go to Rome, where he was put in prison, in virtue of the law against the masters and disciples of witchcraft. He died in 1791. As for Cardinal de Rohan, he became at first a supporter of the Revolution, and was elected to the Constituent Assembly. Was he not a "victim of despotism"? His views changed as soon as the Assembly confiscated the lands of the clergy. He became an ardent enemy of the Revolution, retired to the principality which he had in Germany, gave men and money to the Prince de Condé, and helped the émigrés with the remainder of his revenues. He resigned the bishopric of Strasbourg at the time of the Concordat, and died in 1809. Unworthy of the great name which he bore, he is one of the meanest actors in the great Revolutionary struggle in France; abhorred by the Royalists and despised by the Republicans.

Correspondence.

THE "PROTECTION" OF AMERICAN ART.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The admirers of the present system of taxation of art for the better protection of it from unhealthy competition, might like to explain the following absurdity: The work of American artists being admitted free of duty, out of consideration for the artists' pockets, the Government charges them $2.50 for the certificate which is to prove their identity, and, what is worse, puts them to the inconvenience—sometimes very great—of having to go to the nearest American consul to make the declaration and take out the certificate, and all for the sake of getting a protection which is about as agreeable as a cloak of sheet-iron on a cold day. A curious case has just come to my knowledge which illustrates luminously the utter want of common sense which pervades the tariff legislation of the U. S. A.

A certain eminent wood-engraver, who is living in Italy and working for a well-known magazine, engraving pictures of the early Italian masters *in situ*, and who is at the present moment working at a great distance from any American consulate, is obliged, when he has finished his block and wishes to send it to the publishers, to go a day's journey to get the certificate, and then must send the block by express with a declaration that will satisfy the Custom-house that it is the work of an American artist, while, but for the system of protection of his interests, he might send it by parcels post at the expense of a small fraction of the present tax on his pocket, to say nothing of that on his time and patience; and the block is from a month to two months on the way, when, if he were not protected, the unfortunate man could get it to the office in ten or twelve days. There is probably not another Government out of Asia capable of such utter imbecility as is involved in this arrangement for the protection of men who beg to be relieved from protection, and which gives the Consul an amount of unnecessary work, the artist a very great amount of unnecessary trouble and expense, and the publishers a great deal of inconvenience—and all to raise a tax that is not wanted and which falls on the men who are protected.

The service of the parcels post which is in operation all over Europe is made impossible by our Custom-house regulations between the United States of America and the Old World, so that when I, as an American, wish to get from America an article which falls within the limits of the parcels post, I am obliged to have it sent by the tedious, expensive, and troublesome channel of the trans-European express, instead of which I prefer to get the best English substitute for it, even if it costs a little more in the prime cost. We are an extremely clever people in the way of contriving measures for cutting off our noses for the sake of spiting our neighbors' faces.

Yours in the bonds of ignorance, W.

Rome, January 22, 1890.

MARCOZZI'S PHOTOGRAPHS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Allow me respectfully to call the attention of your readers to the photographs that Marcozzi of 7 Piazza Durini has just taken of all the important pictures in the Poldi-Pezzoli collection. Tourists know how impossible it is for love or money to get good photographs of any pictures save the few favorites. They will be delighted with Marcozzi's, which are perfect reproductions, rivalling Braun's, and at a tenth of the latter's prices. It is to be hoped that the sale of these photographs will be great enough to induce Marcozzi to undertake other collections. B. B.

Milan, January 19, 1890.

THE LATE JOSEPH M. WELLS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In the death of Joseph Morrill Wells the architectural profession has suffered a grievous loss. That fame is not a measure of ability, was never more strikingly shown than in the fact that to many, even among architects, the news of his death was perhaps the first knowledge they had that he had lived. Strong in his convictions, inflexible in maintaining them, impenetrable on short acquaintance, but loyal and warm to those who had won the favor of his friendship, never yielding the principles of his art to the demands of expediency, nor wishing to force himself into public notice, he was content to work quietly with his friends in New York, where, in good-fellowship, fraternity, and mutual esteem, he led a peaceful and contented existence. Shortly before his last illness he said he did not expect, and certainly did not desire, any better opportunities than his work of the last few years had afforded him. Simplicity and purity of design he was ever striving for. His work was as unaffected as himself. He was a respecter of good tradition, and originality for originality's sake he abhorred. The common-sense sturdiness of his opinions and his terse manner of expressing them show in the following remarks of his, which I am able to quote literally:

"If you have a desire to make a good piece of architecture, be sure and use as small a number of materials as possible (*one* best of all, even should it be nothing but mud). No more curds and whey." Deploring the tendency, in much of modern design, to mere prettiness at the expense of form and proportion, which he considered essential and fundamental factors of good work, he maintained that "architecture does not depend on the color of brick, or size of joints, or texture of stone or terracotta. Nearly all buildings are compromised from this cause." The truth of this needs no demonstration. His enthusiasm and interest were by no means confined to his profession. Speaking of a young architect of his acquaintance, he once said: "X——, I think, ought to develop into something. But this is an obscure subject. A new architect is always a surprise and drops down from the skies. If he designed as well as he plays base-ball, he would already be at the top of the profession."

The interval between his Boston career and that in New York he gave to a diligent and exhaustive study of Italian Renaissance; and by making careful drawings of the Farnese and the Cancellaria palaces and others, he cultivated an intimate acquaintance with them, even to the minutest detail. It is safe to say that few architects knew and understood Renaissance as Wells did. Would there were more in the profession willing to study as patiently, and with the capacity to study as understandingly, as he; and, having so studied, able to express the result of their studies in their practice! It is not enough to have principles: we must know what to do with them when we have them. Wells knew.

W. E. C.

Cambridge, February 8, 1890.

SHELLEY'S SKYLARK.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Prof. Corson, in his letter on Browning (in the *Nation* of January 9, 1890), quotes the great poet's opinion upon the now famous "unbodied joy" of Shelley's "Skylark." According to Browning, "unbodied" is "nonsense" in this connection. Whether it be indeed nonsense or not, the Harvard MS. of Shelley shows conclusively that Shelley at any rate wrote it. And as Shelley was not a careless user of words, it remains for his readers to justify him. May I make an attempt—namely, by indicating the steps by which Shelley, we may conjecture, was led to this peculiar form?

Spenser, in his "Shepherd's Calendar," November, line 166, writes thus of the subject of his dirge:

> "She hath the bonds broke of eternall night,
> Her soule unbodied of the burdenous corpse."

Spenser uses here the word "corpse," as frequently, for body in general. And the prefix *un-* is scarcely the negative; rather it is the English equivalent of the German *ent-*, and "unbodied" is the same as our modern "disembodied." The soul of the risen Dido has shaken off the load of the body.

Just before Shelley wrote his "Skylark," Byron had said in his "Manfred," act i., scene 2:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The natural music of the mountain reed—
For here the patriarchal days are not
A pastoral fable—pipes in the liberal air,
Mixed with the sweet bells of the sauntering herd;
My soul would drink these echoes. Oh, that I were
The viewless spirit of a lovely sound,
A living voice, a breathing harmony,
A bodiless enjoyment—born and dying
With the blest tone which made me!"

(Firsted. of 1817, p. 22.)

Two thoughts suggest themselves to me. The first is, that Shelley caught his idea, his situation, so to speak, from Byron. Manfred's enjoyment is literally "bodiless"; whatever view the physicist may take of sound, to the ordinary mind the echo of a mountain pipe or cattle-bell has no body. But Shelley, in substituting Spenser's "unbodied" for Byron's "bodiless," has demonstrated for the thousandth and thousandth time his perfect sanity of taste and speech. Shelley's lark, rising from the earth like Spenser's Dido, shakes off—*to the eye of the listener*—its body, it becomes a mere sound, an "unbodied" joy.

It surprises me that Browning should have failed to detect Shelley's daring metaphor. He seems to tax Shelley with the gross blunder of treating the lark as a thing without a body, whereas the poet merely "figures" the lark into a spirit that has shaken off its body.

J. M. HART.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, February 1, 1890.

PEN-NAMES AND REAL NAMES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the kind and complimentary notice of 'Selections from the Greek Anthology' that appeared a little while since in the *Nation*, your critic, in speaking with warm commendation of the translations by Alma Strettell, flatters me with the conjecture that "Alma Strettell" may be a pen-name of my own. Therefore, I thought it might interest you to know that this is not so, but that Miss Strettell writes under her own name, and is the author of a very fine collection of Spanish and Italian folk-songs, published some two or three years ago.

Will you do me the great kindness of giving publication to the fact that I, also, write solely and simply under my real name, and that I am not, nor have ever been, a Mrs. Sharp?—Believe me, dear sir, yours very truly,

GRAHAM R. TOMSON.

20 ST. JOHN'S WOOD ROAD, LONDON, N. W., January 31, 1890.

THE WASHINGTON ANCESTRY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A few facts as to Ann Pope, the widow of Walter Brodhurst and the second wife of John Washington, the Virginia immigrant, may interest some of your readers.

Her first husband, Walter Brodhurst, was in Virginia as early as 1650, and in 1653 represented Northumberland County in the Legislature. There is a deposition of his, dated August 30, 1655, in which he mentions that he was about thirty-six years of age, and it is known that he was the son of William Brodhurst of Lilleshall, Shropshire, England. Mr. Crallé of Northumberland County, Va., informs the writer that among the old records of that county there is a judgment dated July, 1656, in favor of Walter Brodhurst, and that the next reference to him is in a suit brought on September 30, 1659, by Anne Brodhurst, relict and administratrix of Walter Brodhurst.

In a note on page 80 of the last (January) number of the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, the writer alluded to the baptism in September, 1659, of a young son of John Washington, and suggested that he was a child by the second wife—which is a mistake, as at that time she had not married Washington. When the widow Brodhurst became his wife, she had a son, Walter Brodhurst, who went to England and lived and died at his father's birthplace. By John Washington she had a son Lawrence (the ancestor of Gen. Washington), who was buried, in 1697, at Bridges Creek, Westmoreland County, Virginia.

EDWARD D. NEILL.

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA.

BLOOD-CURDLING ITEMS FOR SENATOR INGALLS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The *National Economist*, the official organ of the National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, published in Washington city, has, in its issue of the 25th ult., two items, bearing on the race problem in the South, of such unparalleled atrocity and cold-blooded fiendishness that it is a wonder they could have escaped the eagle-eyed Mr. Ingalls, as, scissors in hand, he daily scans the newspapers for gory material for his Senatorial scrap-book:

Item first:

Proclamation is made (by Andrew J. Carothurs for one and R. M. Humphrey for the other) that the two colored alliance organizations are now consolidated and to be known as the Colored Farmers' National Alliance and Coöperative Union, with headquarters at Houston, Texas. Thus following in the line of consolidation by the organizations of white farmers, this noble work has been done. The following proclamation we clip from the organ of the order, the *National Alliance* (Houston, Texas):

"Whereas, In the providence of Almighty God, the great leaders of the opposing colored alliances have this day met, and, sacrificing their own interests and all personal ambition, have agreed to unite and consolidate our jarring and discordant orders into a single grand alliance; and whereas, our dissensions heretofore have divided our churches, broken up our schools, embittered our communities, and created discord in our families; and whereas, less than three years ago, our order came into existence without a membership and with an empty treasury, and we now have a million members, with business activities in more than twenty States, exchanges permanently established in half a dozen great cities, and we are everywhere enjoying the greatest good will and the hearty coöperation of the white inhabitants of all the States. Wherefore it well becomes us, the recipients of such countless blessings and boundless prosperity, to remember the Almighty Giver of all good, and humbly to look up to Him from whom all our strength comes.

"Now, therefore, I, R. M. Humphrey, General Superintendent of the Colored Farmers' National Alliance and Coöperative Union, do issue this, my proclamation, recommending to all colored alliances of every name and order in the United States, and all colored persons friendly to the alliance and the progress of their race, to observe Saturday, the 22d day of February, A. D. 1890, as a day of solemn prayer and joyous thanksgiving to the God of nations.

"(1.) Let your National and State exchanges and coöperative stores and all your places of business be closed for that day. Do no work of any kind. Make it a day of rest to all your people.

"(2.) Let the members of your hitherto discordant alliances seek each other out, and let them mutually forgive one another—burying every grudge and all envy, hatred, and malice, renewing among yourselves pledges of brotherly love, Christian fellowship, alliance, good-will. Let peace and love reign.

"(3.) Assemble yourselves at your churches and places of worship promptly at ten o'clock A. M., and continue your devotional exercises until two o'clock P. M.

"Finally, all organizers, trustees, superintendents, secretaries, and others, no matter to what alliance they have heretofore belonged, are charged to read this proclamation in the lodges and congregations, and see that it is published to all the people. Let your meetings be conducted soberly. Spend no part of this, your sacred day, about the streets nor in idle gossip."

Item second:

NOTICE.

To the Colored Farmers' Union of Louisiana:

Arrangements have been made with T. A Clayton, State Agent of the Farmers' Union of Louisiana, by which the Colored Union of Louisiana can trade through the agency and receive all the benefits of cheap goods without the expense of a separate agency, and thus unite the financial strength of both orders. It will certainly be to the advantage of both, and, as both organizations are working for the same objects, the Colored Farmers' Union will coöperate with the Farmers' Union whenever it is possible to do so.

A. L. PLUMMER,
Gen'l Supt. C. F. U., Funny Louis, La.

Now, these extracts show a truly lamentable state of affairs. Within the brief period of the three past years, *one million* negroes in the South have, at the muzzles of Winchester rifles and shotguns, been driven and hunted and hounded by the whites into this coöperative *movement among themselves*, and under the fear of torture and death been "bulldozed" into acquiring property, into selling their agricultural products for higher rates, and into buying the necessaries of life for lower.

Something must be done, and that at once, to put down this brutal lawlessness in the South, and secure more "justice" for the poor defenceless, down-trodden blacks, or the country is irrevocably gone to the demnition bow-wows. Valuable suggestions might be given the Senator in this dire emergency by those philanthropic ex-Confederate statesmen, Gen. Mahone of Virginia and Chalmers of Mississippi. "A National Suppression Law" should be passed at once, for, if these horrible outrages continue in such barbaric deviltry, there is no telling but that at the next Presidential election these million members of the Colored Farmers' Alliance and Coöperative Union may be intimidated by their white alliance neighbors and friends—a majority of whom are, of course, Democrats—into voting for tariff reform and against Trusts, monopolies and similar pet schemes, dear to the heart of the G. O. P.

In explanation, I would add the significant fact that the colored and the white alliances in the South, while working side by side for a common end—the better protection and development of the agricultural interests of the country—*are entirely separate and distinct as to membership*. And in this effort of the negroes to improve their material condition, and to become more responsible and trustworthy as citizens, they always receive substantial help and friendly counsel from the whites, as is proved, in part, by the "notice" quoted above.

Respectfully, FRANK NOLAND.

HEWLETT'S, HANOVER CO., VA., February 6, 1890.

AN OBJECT LESSON IN CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The following extract from the report of an interview with Capt. A. H. Reed, a local Minnesota politician, published in the St. Paul *Pioneer Press* of January 27, would serve as an effective tract for the civil-service reformers. The interview had reference to the efforts of Capt. Reed in favor of Capt. Danahower, candidate for the office of Collector of Internal Revenue of Minnesota.

"The facts," said Capt. Reed to a *Pioneer Press* correspondent, "are these: I was for Capt. Danahower for Collector, and I did not care who knew it. I pleaded with Senator Washburn without avail, but he told me he would recommend Capt. Danahower for Marshal. I called on Senator Davis for a letter of introduction to Secretary Blaine. After receiving it I said to Senator Davis: 'Senator, are you willing I should interest myself in Capt. Danahower's behalf?' 'Yes,' he said, 'but do not use my name in doing so.' I went to Secretary Windom on a matter of my own, and incidentally asked the Secretary what the trouble was that Capt. Danahower could not be appointed Collector of Internal Revenue for Minnesota with the war record and the backing he had. The Secretary said

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the President would not appoint until the Senators could agree, and he did not wish to interfere, as it was a Senatorial appointment. I said to the Secretary that the President had taken it upon himself to appoint Mr. Hay District Attorney without the Senators agreeing, and to even the thing up he ought to appoint Capt. Danahower.

"I kept track of the matter by calling at Mr. Byrnes's office, and a few days after was told by the appointment clerk that the President had sent over that day for the 'briefs' in the Minnesota Collector's case. I asked if he supposed I could get to see the President that day, and he said as it was Cabinet day he thought not. I then went to Gen. Bacheler, First Assistant Secretary, who I was told would take an interest in the 'old soldiers.' I laid the case before him in as strong terms as I could. I told him that *the Republicans of Minnesota were getting mad to see the Democrats holding down the best offices under a Republican administration, and they were getting d——n mad, and I was one of them.* Mr. Bacheler said: '*You go right to the President and talk to him as you have to me.*' From there I went to Gen. Mason, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and told him the situation of things as to appointment of Collector for Minnesota. He said it was a matter of the Secretary's. I told him that the Secretary had said to me that he did not wish to interfere, upon which the Commissioner remarked, 'If the Secretary will intimate that to me, I will settle the matter in short order.'

"The next day I called on the President, sent in my card, and was ushered into his presence. He met me with extended hand, and, as I wanted to get on the soft side of him, if possible, I introduced myself as a comrade who had served with him in the Army of the Cumberland. I saw at once he was bound to be as cold as the St. Paul ice palace. I said that I had called on a business matter, in behalf of the old soldiers of Minnesota, who wanted Capt. Danahower appointed Collector of Internal Revenue of Minnesota, and *I wished he would move in the matter at once, as the Republicans of our State were getting impatient.* He said, in substance, this: 'You are not supposed to understand the difficulties we have to labor under and the pressure brought to bear. Within the last twenty-four hours some forty letters and telegrams have come in asking for a new man. It is thought a Scandinavian ought to be appointed to that office.' *I did feel somewhat hot,* and said: '*If such men as Capt. Danahower, who rendered the country the service he did from 1861 to 1865, must be turned down for a Scandinavian just because he is a Scandinavian, then it is time we knew it.*' *I turned and left him without further remarks,* and came across Secretary Blaine in the room below, who, it appeared, had heard my conversation with the President, for he asked, '*What were you and the President having such a racket about?*'"

In all this graphic recital it is hard to know whom to pity most—foot-sore and heart-sick Capt. Reed; Capt. Danahower turned down, it is to be feared, in spite of his record, for a new man; the two Minnesota Senators standing between the cross-fire of "old soldiers" and Scandinavians; the various Cabinet officers and other public servants vainly trying to snatch a few moments for their official duties between the invasions of office-hunters; President Harrison with his forty letters and telegrams in twenty-four hours; or the people of the United States. F. B. T.

St. Paul, February 2, 1890.

ARE WE IN NEED OF A NAVY THAT SHALL "SWEEP THE SEAS"?

To the Editor of The Nation:

Friend: In a speech, made a few days ago by William E. Gladstone, at the old town of Chester, not far from his home at Hawarden, surprise and regret were expressed that this Republic—turning aside from its traditions of the past—should of late have embarked upon the policy of building up and burdening itself with a great navy, according to the bad way of the old European nationalities. From one who, when he was leader of the party in power in England, deliberately withdrew from a war (that of the Transvaal) which he was convinced had been unjustly undertaken, this observation upon the mistaken and dangerous policy—as he conceives it to be—which we have entered upon, comes with a good grace, and may be freely accepted as proffered in all sincerity and as dictated by a pure purpose of helpfulness. It is the language of wisdom, large experience, and common sense, and I feel assured that our people would do well to heed its friendly intimations.

Only about two years have elapsed, I believe, since a highly respectable delegation came hither from Great Britain, bearers of a memorial signed by between two and three hundred members of Parliament, commending to our President and Congress and the American people generally the desirability of entering into a definite treaty of arbitration between the two countries. Since then there has more than one international dispute been peaceably adjusted by the good offices of arbitrators. So that, since the beginning of the century, as we are told, not less than sixty cases of disagreement have been amicably settled. With such a record before us, pointing the way to the happy disposition of all international disputes, how is it that we are suddenly awaking to the discovery that we are practically defenceless, and that the immediate creation and equipment of a powerful navy, second to none in the world, is an imperative necessity?

Then there is the calling together of the delegates from all the American republics, a widely published purpose of which gathering is to formulate a plan for the prevention of all wars between the States represented, by entering into an agreement to submit all cases in dispute, not otherwise adjustable, to arbitration. This clause in Secretary Blaine's address of welcome to the delegates certainly reads well: "We believe that friendship, crowned with candor and maintained with good faith, will remove from American States the necessity of guarding boundary lines between themselves with fortifications and military force." Now, that has the sound of having been written with "candor," and framed in "good faith," and there is not apparent any reason why we should "read between the lines." Were there the remotest reason for believing this to be so, the Spanish-American delegates now at the national capital would straightway gather together their *impedimenta,* and report at the capitals of their respective republics with the greatest celerity. Obviously, the great clamor for navy preparation which has arisen at Washington, and is seconded in some other quarters, does not contemplate anything of aggressiveness in connection with our sister republics of this continent.

Well, then, what have we done, or what are we about to do, that all this haste for providing ourselves with an irresistible fleet of war-ships, monitors, dynamite-cruisers, torpedo-boats, etc., is deemed to be urgently necessary? We do not propose to quarrel with any of our neighbors all the way down the west Atlantic and east Pacific seaboards to the mingling of the waters at the Straits of Magellan—a waterway that a few years ago was declared by Chili and the Argentine Confederation to be neutral, and upon the shores of which the fortifications of neither nation, nor of any other nation, were ever to be erected. And as regards England, France, Germany, and the other European Powers, is there any reason why our reciprocal intentions and behavior should not be attended with as much "friendship," "candor," and "good faith" as our intercourse with the States of Mexico and the several republics of South America? At any rate, would it not be wise on our part, and reassuring and helpful to the nationalities on the other side of the Atlantic, burdened as they are with the accumulated charges for past wars, and of a state of preparation for possible impending conflicts almost equal to the cost of war itself, to worry along about as we have in the past, to deal openly and justly with our neighbors and acquaintances, whether they be Spanish-American, European, or Mongolian, and so make it apparent that friendship, candor, and good faith are a better defence than a big standing army, elaborate coast defences, and a navy that is warranted to "sweep the seas"? Josiah W. Leeds.

Philadelphia.

THE INVESTIGATOR AS TEACHER.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In the discussion on the subject of teaching in colleges and universities, your correspondents have ignored (or, at least, have not clearly stated) the purpose of the so-called higher education, namely, the training of the judgment. A teacher, to be competent from this point of view, must have learned to exercise his own judgment. This is only possible when he has investigated some subject for himself—that is, when he has learned to form an independent opinion based upon his personal observations and experiments. Our opinions in practical every-day life are not considered of much importance until we have had experience upon which to found our opinions. In the great realm of apparently conflicting facts in the literary and scientific world, a clear and independent judgment is a necessity, if we are to gain lasting benefit from college or university training. Mere facts are soon forgotten, and are of little use unless we know the relation between them. Facility in forming an independent opinion is also that which gives an educated man the advantage over an uneducated one, even though he begin his career later than the latter.

It is true that an original investigator is often a poor teacher, and sometimes so fully absorbed in his own specialty that the student learns little from him aside from this specialty and how he has come to this or that conclusion in a certain line of work. On the other hand, a student learns from a teacher who is not himself constantly learning new facts and exercising his judgment in new questions, more facts, perhaps, but not how to use them.

The question being agitated in your columns has already been discussed in Germany, and when a new position is to be filled, the qualities of the candidate as a teacher and as an original investigator are both carefully weighed. From thirty to forty years ago the experiment was made of filling teachers' positions with those who were most successful in the reproduction of others' ideas; but the result was not satisfactory, and at present it is customary to elect such men to professorships as have become prominent through their original investigations. Students who have spent years in study under the direction of those who only reproduce the ideas of others, find that when they come to compete with those who have studied with original workers, they have missed the most important part of an education—the habit of forming an independent opinion. A. L. G.

Zurich, January 24, 1890.

A DIFFERENCE IN GERMAN AND AMERICAN UNIVERSITY METHODS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: One of the chief factors in the advancement of scientific knowledge in Germany is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what is known as the Privatdocentenwesen. Du Bois-Reymond, in one of his inaugural addresses, calls this institution "the principal source from which our universities derive that spirit of bold research and penetrating inquiry which is perhaps the most distinctive quality of German scholarship." And, indeed, a glance at the position filled by the Privatdocent shows that there is hardly a place within the university more honorable or more influential. Any young man who has won his doctorate, and who has convinced the faculty of a German university that he is an independent searcher after truth, may be admitted at once to exactly the same kind of teaching in which the oldest members of the faculty are engaged. In entering upon this work he assumes none but self-imposed obligations; he is not encumbered with conducting examinations; he has no share in the wearisome administrative work of the university; his whole time is given to an absolutely independent pursuit of the line of investigation and instruction which he has chosen.

The success which this institution has had, both as to the number of persons availing themselves of its privileges and with regard to the work done by them, is remarkable. As to the first point, it must be remembered that, aside from the scanty fees paid by the students and from occasional pecuniary aid granted by the Government, the Privatdocenten receive no money remuneration; and surely, from a worldly point of view, their position is not enviable. Nevertheless, the average proportion of Privatdocenten to the total number of the University teaching force during the fifty years from 1830–80 was about 25 per cent., and the last five years show a very decided increase even beyond this limit. With regard to the second point, it is significant that a larger percentage of Privatdocenten than of "ordentliche Professoren" are engaged in special and advanced teaching.

The following table is compiled from the *Lectionsverzeichnisse* of the "Philosophische Facultäten" of Berlin and Munich Universities for the current year. Under "general courses" are classed such subjects as the political or literary history of a people, the elements of philosophy, the outlines of a certain branch of science; under "special courses," such subjects as the history of a special institution, the study of an individual author, the study of a single physical phenomenon. As it was my aim to get at the two extreme ends of the academic scale, the "ausserordentliche Professoren" were left out of consideration; and as every university teacher without exception conducts a seminar, or a course corresponding to it, this element also was omitted from the comparison. The figures indicate the percentage:

	Courses.		
	Gen. only.	Spec. only.	Gen. and spec.
(1.) Berlin—			
Ordentl. Professoren	37.2	25.5	37.2
Privatdocenten	19.3	52.6	28
(2.) Munich—			
Ordentl. Professoren	58.3	8.3	3.3
Privatdocenten	25	58.3	16.6

It is evident from this table that the number of professors who lecture exclusively on general or elementary subjects is at Berlin almost, at Munich more than twice, as large as that of Privatdocenten engaged in the same kind of subjects; that the number of Privatdocenten who lecture exclusively on special or advanced subjects is at Berlin more than twice, at Munich more than seven, times as large as that of professors engaged in the same kind of subjects; while in both places a considerably smaller proportion of Privatdocenten than of professors lecture both on advanced and elementary subjects.

This, then, is the distribution of work in the two largest German universities, which I have selected as specimens to illustrate what is a general tendency of German university education, namely, to let the older men do the bulk of fundamental instruction—to intrust the special investigation and research mainly to the young men.

From the following table of the distribution of work at Harvard and Cornell we may derive some information as to the methods pursued in this respect in American colleges. Here also only the two ends of the academic scale, the "full professors" and the "instructors," are considered. With reference to the different character of work done in American and German universities, I have here used the expressions "elementary" and "advanced" courses, instead of general and special:

	Courses.		
	Elem. only.	Adv. only.	Elem. and adv.
(1.) Harvard, '89-'90—			
Professors	00	27.02	72.9
Instructors.....	56.5	8.7	34.7
(2.) Cornell, '88-'89—			
Professors.....	7.6	19.2	73.3
Instructors.....	68.9	6.8	24.1

It appears, then, that at Harvard there is no fraction, at Cornell a very small one, of professors who teach elementary subjects only, whereas more than half of the instructors at Harvard, and nearly three-fourths at Cornell, are engaged in just that kind of work exclusively; that the number of professors who teach advanced subjects only is in both institutions somewhat more than three times as large as that of the instructors engaged in advanced teaching exclusively; finally, that in both places the majority of the professors and a minority of the instructors are giving both elementary and advanced instruction.

If I add that in the graduate department at Yale thirty-six professors and only four instructors offer independently advanced instruction (the rest of the instructors who figure in the announcement of the department act either as assistants in a professor's course or offer nothing beyond elementary work); if I add that at Johns Hopkins of the ten "associates" only two are exempt from undergraduate work, it seems perfectly evident that the prevailing tendency in American universities is to let the young men do the bulk of elementary instruction, and to intrust the advanced instruction mainly to men of long experience and of established reputation.

That the German system is considered a success in Germany there can be no doubt. It is universally felt that the professors, through wider experience and practical efficiency, are best adapted to represent the foundations and the system of their science in their accepted form; that the Privatdocenten, full of the enthusiasm of youth and unhampered by official routine, are best fitted to reach out into new fields and to train investigators; that the competition of one with the other furnishes a continual source of rejuvenation to the university.

In America we are now making earnest efforts to put our graduate instruction upon a more scientific basis than it has had heretofore. Can we not learn from the German experience?

Respectfully, KUNO FRANCKE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, February 5, 1890.

Notes.

IN our recent review of McCarthy's 'Lily Lass,' we said that the English of this novel was "not always improved by American proof-reading." Messrs. Appleton inform us that they used for their edition stereotype plates made in England. We regret the faulty but not unnatural inference from the American imprint. It was not, we may add, in our thought to cast a slur on American proof-reading, or to compare it at all with British.

Charles Scribner's Sons announce that they have acquired from Mr. Henry M. Stanley all the American rights for his personal narrative of the expedition for the relief of Emin Pasha. Prior to the appearance of the complete work, *Scribner's Magazine* will publish an article upon his last journey by Mr. Stanley. It will be illustrated.

Longmans, Green & Co. publish immediately, in their series of "Historic Towns," 'Winchester,' by G. W. Kitchin, the Dean of Winchester; and 'The Skipper in the Arctic Seas,' by Walter J. Clutterbuck.

Vol. vii. of the "Bankside Shakspere," "Titus Andronicus," is about to be distributed to subscribers. The introduction is by Mr. A. A. Adee. The "Hamlet" introduction will be from the pen of Mr. E. P. Vining.

Ginn & Co. will publish in April 'The Best Elizabethan Plays,' exclusive of Shakspere, edited by William R. Thayer.

In acknowledging the issue of 'The Year's Art,' for the current year (London: J. S. Virtue & Co.), it cannot come amiss to restate the nature of this standard work edited by Mr. Marcus B. Huish. The sub-title correctly reads: "A concise epitome of all matters relating to the arts of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture which have occurred during the year 1889, together with information respecting the events of the year 1890, with full-page illustrations." In addition to the regular and indispensable features, such as the accounts of exhibitions and the directory of artists, we have this year more photo-engraved memoranda of the principal pictures and statuary, and a fresh batch of portraits, viz., of artists of the Royal Society of Painters in Water-Colors. Mr. Huish has also been at pains to procure a list of artist birthdays, arranged by months, with an alphabetic key. In short, 'The Year's Art' is better than ever, and nothing further need be said.

Macmillan & Co. have become the American publishers of the sixth edition of the Royal Geographical Society's 'Hints to Travellers,' of which we spoke in praise a few weeks ago.

Mr. P. H. Emerson's 'English Idyls' we likewise commended, but still more recently; and the dainty "pictures of East Anglian life" have now passed to a second, revised edition (London: Sampson Low & Co.).

We have received from Mr. John Osborne Austin, Providence, R. I., a leaf of Additions and Corrections for insertion in his admirable 'Genealogical Dictionary of Rhode Island.' Nearly the whole alphabet is involved, and many of the leading families, as, Almy, Chad Brown, Bull, Jeremiah Clarke, Durfee, Greene, Obadiah Holmes, Roger Williams (thanks to Mr. H. F. Waters's late discoveries), etc.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Railroad, Telegraph, and Steamship Builders' Directory, issued annually by the Railway Directory Company of this city, comes to us with its second number. It occupies a field of its own, and has an obvious value for its special patrons. The print is very good.

For another class—yet not wholly distinct—has been devised the 'Route and Reference Book of the United States and Canada,' for the use of commercial travellers, merchants, and others (New York: Gibb Bros. & Moran). It is a sort of handy gazetteer, with maps and the needful local statistics as to trade. Not only is the distance between stations indicated on the maps, but the fare to the chief places. The editor justly observes that many of the features of this publication will serve the tourist for pleasure as well as the traveller for business. The design seems very well carried out.

'The Land and the Community' is the title of a small book by the Rev. S. W. Thackeray, M.A., LL.D. (D. Appleton & Co.). The basis of the author's argument consists of two assumptions—one, that the squalid civilization of the early clan was "politically perfect"; the other, that political economy "has declared that private property in land is fundamentally wrong and unjust in principle." There is nothing that deserves notice in the book; but the introduction, which is furnished by Henry George, contains a delightful passage wherein it is graciously intimated that he may be persuaded to exempt the estates of the Church and the institutions of learning from confiscation—provided the clergy and the professors will embrace his theories. The Koran or the sword!

A recent number in the "Questions of the Day" series, published by the Putnams, is entitled 'Monopolies and the People.' The author, Mr. Charles Whiting Baker, points out the various kinds of monopoly, which are extremely numerous under his definition, and shows that, under the modern conditions of competition, such monopolies are unavoidable. Their evils, in his view, might be checked by combining governmental regulation with private management, and a "practical plan" of control is submitted. One of the obstacles which such a plan would encounter would be, in our judgment, the Constitution of the United States; others would be found in the constitution of human nature. But as the application of the remedy is to be postponed until "all good men and true . . . join hands to put only men of wisdom and honor in places of public trust," there will be ample time to smooth the road. While the author exaggerates the evil results of so-called monopolies, his tone is far more moderate than that of most of the writers who have favored the public with their speculations upon these subjects. As he proposes no general confiscation, he cannot expect to obtain much popularity.

The publishers of *Babyhood* have begun to give fresh currency to much good matter hid away in the bound volumes of that excellent periodical. Hence a pretty little series of Nursery Health Tracts, on scarlet fever, diet for young children, diptheria, and sound teeth. The mother can make these into a "card catalogue" for ready reference.

The 'Complete Index to Littell's Living Age' (Philadelphia: Edward Roth) advances another stage in the department of History (France—United States).

The Essex Institute Historical Collections for July–September, 1888, is mainly occupied with the part taken by Essex County, Mass., in the organization and settlement of the Northwest Territory—and no mean part, as all the world knows. Seven of the nine names most conspicuously associated with the passage of the Northwest Ordinance "belong distinctively" to that little bit of territory. The editing consists of extracts from well-known and authoritative sources, without comment, but not without notes.

Strange as it may seem, statistics show that there are 133 villages in Massachusetts quite without town libraries. On Wednesday, January 29, a meeting of ladies and gentlemen was held in Boston, at the house of Mrs. Phillips, to confer as to the best methods of improving this surprising state of things. Gen. Francis A. Walker presided, and letters expressing cordial sympathy in the work were read from James Russell Lowell and George W. Cable. Interesting remarks were made by many persons, in several cases relating to their own experience of starting libraries in small places. It was unanimously agreed that the effort should be made as far as possible from within, by the people themselves, and that extraneous aid should not be too obvious. Among the speakers were Judge Chamberlain, Prof. Palmer, and Mr. Green of Worcester. A committee was appointed which will report later upon the work laid out.

The *Library Journal* for January announces the withdrawal of Mr. R. R. Bowker from the co-editorship with Mr. C. A. Cutter, his place being taken by Mr. Paul Leicester Ford. It begins, with an account of the library of the United States Geological Survey, a series of papers relating to special collections; and reference is made to a scheme for the extension of the card catalogue so as to indicate such collections, or important books, not accessible in any given library. The editor has hopes that in 1900 a great Catalogue of American Books of the Nineteenth Century can be undertaken, "providing the final basis for American trade bibliography." Mr. W. I. Fletcher's 'Index to General Literature' (*i. e.*, books of essays, travels, biography, etc.) is well advanced for publication in or soon after 1891.

A plate by Cruikshank, in the *Studio* for February 1, surpasses the other illustrations in interest in three particulars: it has never before been published, it was an essay of a title-page for the 'Sketches by Boz,' and it is a sample of the "process work" of 1836, the invention of Charles Louis Schönberg. The account of this autographic lithographic "etching in relief" (if the phrase is tolerable) is by Mr. James Schönberg, presumably a descendant of the inventor.

The Boston *Transatlantic*, with its customary enterprise, furnishes its readers, in its issue of February 1, with a portrait of François Coppée and a translation of his drama "Le Pater," interdicted by the censorship. Ibsen's "Rosmersholm" is continued.

M. Octave Uzanne's *Le Livre Moderne* is a typographical success. The specimen number before us expressly omits the *gravures hors texte sur papier d'épreuves*, and of these we cannot speak. "Hodiernus non hesternus" is the motto; but yesterday claims its rights in a reminiscential sketch of the late Champfleury, with three capital caricatures. ("We must begin to save our pennies," said a bibliophile on hearing of the death of this collector, whose precious things must ere long come under the hammer). Backward-looking might also be thought the head-piece to page 1 of a January magazine, showing a Bacchanalian performance *libertate decembri*. There are some informal book notices, some reports of sales, and a variety of matter intentionally unsubstantial.

A somewhat despondent view of the tendency to conflict among our manifold jurisdictions is taken by Mr. Wm. M. Meigs in Nos. 24 and 25 of vol. 29 of the *Central Law Journal*. Many years ago the Supreme Court of the United States took the position that in cases involving "general principles of jurisprudence" they would not hold themselves bound to follow the law of the State in which the case arose. The lower Federal courts have naturally followed this precedent, and Mr. Meigs cites cases showing that some State courts have taken similar action, and refused to apply the *lex loci contractus*. The disastrous results of such a practice, should it become generally adopted, are obvious; but it scarcely seems to us that the tendency is marked enough to cause present alarm. It is perhaps well, however, that attention should be directed to it. Mr. Meigs states the rule of Federal decisions in citizenship cases to be that Federal courts will apply the law of the proper State, except: (1) where "general principles" are controlling; (2) where the meaning of a written instrument is involved and the State court has not settled it; (3) where recent State decisions overrule prior ones in force when the contract was made; and (4) where there is no State ruling to follow.

'Troldtöj' (Troll Stories), now in course of publication by Ernst Bojesen of Copenhagen, is without doubt the most artistic Scandinavian book of the season. The first number appeared in December, and the whole will form ten monthly parts. The text, which consists of both prose and verse, is by Holger Drachmann, the subjects being taken from the popular superstitions of the present day. A special feature of the first two numbers is the illustrations, which will consist of woodcuts and full-page photogravures by well-known Danish artists. The price for the whole work will be between sixteen and eighteen kroner (say five dollars), and subscriptions may be sent to any Danish publisher.

The results of the double expedition sent by the Royal Astronomical Society of London to observe the total solar eclipse of December 22 have been disastrous in both cases. Clouds prevented Mr. Taylor in West Africa from taking even a single photograph; while the fears of Father Perry's friends, caused by the delay in receiving his report, are but too sadly confirmed in the melancholy news of his death, from dysentery, December 27. The weather at the Salut Isles, off French Guiana, where he was stationed, was but moderately good. Successful exposures were made with the Abney four-inch lens, but the development was not carried out. Successful photographs were also obtained with the twenty-inch mirror, but these, again, were not developed. Father Perry has been a member of more astronomical expeditions than any man now living, and he was always a cheerful sufferer in the cause of science. Of the climate encountered by the other English expedition, Mr. Taylor seems not at all enamoured, writing of the stifling heat—98° in his cabin at night off Bonny, at one of the mouths of the Niger. He had a pleasant interview with Commander Pullen, who was determining the latitude and longitude of Bonny, although he had suffered from the coast fever severely. His sad death occurred before Mr. Taylor left. At the mouth of the Congo the country was found to be open, hilly, and pleasant. Mr. Taylor himself had an attack of the fever, of which he speaks as "simply awful." Temperature in the sun at Loanda was 135°, 90° in the shade. The English and American parties were established nearer one another than was at first contemplated. The health of our expedition on the *Pensacola* seems to have been uniformly good and without a touch of the fever.

Several interesting papers were read at the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meeting of the Royal Meteorological Society on December 18. The most technical in character were by Mr. W. H. Dines (1) "Report of the Wind-Force Committee on the Factor of the Kew pattern Robinson Anemometer," and (2) "On testing Anemometers." Others were by Mr. G. J. Symons, F.R.S., "On the Rainfall of the Riviera," and a "Report on the Phenological Observations for 1889," by Mr. E. Mawley. The last was a discussion of observations on the flowering of plants, the appearance of insects, the nesting and song of birds, and other attractive subjects of study.

The American Economic Association sets a singular example of mingling business and *réclame* in announcing the award of a prize offered by Mrs. Amélie Rives Chanler, with the proceeds, we are told, of "some exquisite sonnets which were published in *Harper's Monthly* for 1888, and which were by some pronounced superior to Mrs. Browning's 'Cry of the Children.'"

A fund is being raised to procure for the University Library at Cambridge, England, a bust of the late William Wright, Professor of Arabic, an approved model having been already made by J. Hutchinson. Half a guinea is the subscription, and this sum can be addressed by Americans to Prof. R. Gottheil, Columbia College, N. Y.

The late Dr. Döllinger has bequeathed his large and valuable library to the University of Munich, with the stipulation that it shall be sold and the proceeds devoted to stipends for poor students of all departments. Among his posthumous papers is an interesting correspondence with several dignitaries of the Catholic Church, touching the promulgation of the dogma of the papal infallibility and other doctrinal and ecclesiastical questions. The correspondence will be published at an early date.

"E. P. E." writes to us from Munich as follows: "The interesting letter by 'E E.' on 'The Kulturkampf in Bavaria,' published in the *Nation* for December 5, 1889, contains an error which, even after the lapse of so many weeks, it may be well to correct. Baron von Lutz is not a Protestant, but a Catholic, although a very liberal one. It would surely be an anomaly if the Minister of Worship in such a stronghold of Catholicism as Bavaria should be a Protestant. Indeed, no Protestant, however great his ability might be, could ever attain such a position in the Bavarian Government."

Apropos of our notice last week of the life of Dr. Grisanowski, a genial Königsberger of ripe years sends us this amusing anecdote:

"'Grisanowski, Du musst belohnt werden!' Your *Nation* of to-day brought to my mind the old Königsberg proverb. More than seventy years ago every boy knew it and used it frequently. The grandfather, I think, was the hero of the story. It was then customary to get together at lunch time and be rather merry for an hour or so, of course over a glass of wine. Now, Grisanowski had decided to drop the habit. Accordingly, the next day he passed the wonted door and proceeded on his way. Suddenly he stopped short, and said: 'Grisanowski, Du musst belohnt werden.' Then he turned back, entered the door, and took his daily glass!"

— The Bahrein Islands, in the Persian Gulf, are the subject of an unusually interesting paper by Mr. J. Theodore Bent in the January Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society. These islands, which in the last four centuries have been successively in the possession of the Portuguese, the Persians, and Arabians, are now ruled by an Arab sheikh, under the protection of Great Britain. They have lost most of their ancient commercial importance, but are still noted for their pearl fisheries, which produce the best pearls in the world; for their excellent breed of horses and donkeys and their fine dates. One of the two principal towns, Moharek, gets its water supply from a spring which at high tide is about six feet below the surface of the sea, when water is brought up either by divers who go down with skins, or by pushing a hollow bamboo down into it. There are several similar springs on the coast, and the Arabs say they come from the Euphrates, which they believe flows in an underground channel beneath the Persian Gulf—a legend as old, at least, as Pliny's time. In the northwestern part of the principal island, which is about twenty-seven miles long by ten miles broad, are a great number of sepulchral mounds, covering an area of many miles and varying from over forty feet in height to mere circular heaps of stones. One examined by Mr. Bent consisted of two chambers, one above the other. No inscriptions or objects of glass were found among the bones, drapery, ornaments, and other objects. Their great antiquity is inferrible, and from this Mr. Bent regards the tombs as of Phœnician origin, and believes Bahrein to be "the land of Punt from which the Puni got their name" and from whence they migrated to the Mediterranean. In the discussion which followed the reading of the paper before the Society, Mr. Cecil H. Smith of the British Museum said that, "as far as the evidence went at present, he thought the Museum authorities were prepared to admit that the Bahrein Islands probably represented a primitive site of the Phœnician race." He also added that these excavations would reopen the controversy which had raged among Egyptologists as to the identification of the land of Punt.

—The *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement* for December 15 is a number especially worthy of notice from an article upon Giordano Bruno which it contains. The writer is M. Georges Lafaye, and we do not remember to have seen among the very great number of reviews of Bruno's life and work that have appeared since the dedication of his statue in Rome last summer any one that seemed fairer or more trustworthy than this appears to be, and none that is so interesting. One misses in it the striking comparison of Bruno with Shelley that we had in the *Westminster Review*, but there is in its place a very instructive paragraph upon the influence of Rabelais upon Bruno. M. Lafaye is not at all concerned to hide the less attractive characteristics of his philosopher, his uneasy restlessness, his boastfulness, his readiness to upset everything. But these shadows only heighten the light that he throws upon what was in many much more important regards a very high and noble character. Bruno seems to have been looked upon with much less favor by those scholars of his time who more or less shared his opinions than by the universities, the corner-stone of whose teaching he was eager to tear out. Except at Geneva, he was generally received not only with hospitality, but also with what seems a very considerable degree of open-mindedness, when one remembers that at that time the infallibility of Aristotle was much more thoroughly believed in than the infallibility of the Pope. Besides M. Lafaye's article, the *Revue* contains the conclusion of a paper on "Pedagogic Preparation in Germany," by Prof. Voss of Christiania; an article by M. G. Monod on the "Study of History in France," which is of bibliographical value, but rather heavy reading; and the usual *Chronique*, which contains the full text of article 23 of the French military law of which we lately spoke.

—The late distinguished Spanish actor Rafael Calvo is made the subject of a biographical sketch and the occasion of some remarks on the modern Spanish theatre in the last of the 'Literary Pamphlets' of "Clarin" (Leopoldo Alas). Born at Seville March 19, 1842, Calvo came of good actor stock and early went upon the stage, not from choice, but to earn a living. His first success was won under the spur of mortified pride: he overheard his manager telling his father that he would never do as an actor. That night he threw such passion into his acting that he carried off all the glory of the company, though his part was a minor one. After that he appeared as *galán jóven* in all the principal theatres of Spain, everywhere applauded and admired, and at twenty-four was offered the position of leading actor in a good provincial company. It was not long before he was at Madrid, sustaining the principal rôles in the most famous plays of Calderon, Lope, Tirso, Alarcón, Rojas, and Moreto. He often presented modern plays, and was an intimate friend of Echegaray's; but his preference and his peculiar aptitudes led him chiefly to the classic drama, of which he was acknowledged to be the best interpreter of his day. The lyric outbursts of Calderon and Tirso came to new life on his lips, and the heroic figures of the ancient theatre successfully competed, in him, with the milliner's men of the French imitations. In 1883 he undertook a tour through South America, which brought him new glory and welcome cash. He died of smallpox, September 3, 1888, at Cadiz. Long a friendly rival of Antonio Vico, his death leaves the latter at the head of Spanish actors.

— On January 28 a very important event took place at the British Museum. There was a private view, in the late afternoon, of the galleries lighted for the first time by electricity. For the past five or six years the electric light has been used in the reading-room, which has been kept open until eight or nine o'clock. But no attempt has been made to light the rest of the Museum, which has therefore been closed at dusk and on foggy days to all save readers. That which makes this new departure of special interest is not the mere introduction of the electric light, but the reason for it. At last arrangements have been made to open this very popular national museum in the evening, the only time when a large class of people can visit it. The private view really seems to mark the first step—the entering of the thin end of the wedge—in a complete revolution in this respect; and this revolution will do far more to bring about the much-talked-of elevation of the masses than all the Toynbee Halls and People's Palaces that could be set up in the east and south of London. For the latter naturally can never, in their educational value, expect to compete with nationally supported institutions, which, moreover, workmen and artisans can feel are theirs by right, and not merely by benevolence. South Kensington is already open two or three evenings in the week, but South Kensington is rather out of the way. It is true, the British Museum is convenient only for a very limited section of Londoners; but then it is hoped that the present innovation is only the initial stage towards Sunday opening of all galleries and museums. Of course, the attendance on the 28th was no test of the success of the experiment, since on such occasions the "masses" are always rigorously excluded. The large crowd collected to see how admirably the Museum treasures could be studied by the electric light was made up of the literary, artistic, and political celeb-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rities who always attend private views. But the very different crowd which fills the Museum on bank holidays, helps one to form some idea of the numbers who would always have visited it oftener had they had the chance now to be given them. It is worth recording that this evening opening of the British Museum was carried through Parliament by Mr. Bernard Molloy, one of the Irish members who are supposed to know no policy save that of obstruction, to care for no part of the United Kingdom save Ireland, and to strive to benefit no one but themselves.

—Oxford loses a man of much promise in the death of Canon Aubrey L. Moore. He has been tutor of several colleges and lecturer in ecclesiastical history as deputy for Prof. Bright. During the last year, we believe, he was appointed Dean of Divinity at Magdalen and honorary Canon of Christ Church. Outside the University he was best known through his volume of reprinted essays and reviews, 'Science and the Faith,' which was published about a year ago, and by an essay in the recent book, 'Lux Mundi.' Canon Moore belonged to what we suppose is the latest "school" in the English Church, the liberal Catholics, as perhaps they may be called. This school retains its faith in the doctrine of the Incarnation, while it accepts unhesitatingly and fully the results of late Biblical criticism and the teachings of modern science. Canon Moore died at Oxford on the 17th of January, a victim of the Russian influenza, or grip. He was about forty-one years of age.

—A triple number of the Johns Hopkins University historical publications is devoted to "Federal Government in Canada," by Dr. John G. Bourinot, the author of several works upon Canadian institutions. As we understand it, Johns Hopkins University has had nothing to do with the work except to publish it; the matter consisting of four lectures delivered at Trinity University, Toronto. Students of governmental institutions will find here a very lucid and instructive treatment of the Constitution of the Dominion of Canada, which, as a federal constitution, differs principally from our own in that powers not specifically reserved to the provinces are exercised by the general Government. The book will be found a useful complement to Prof. Bryce's 'American Commonwealth,' and will take permanent rank as a constitutional manual. The style is noticeable for its smoothness. Those who are sceptical as to "what's in a name" may peruse with profit the following anecdote, which we quote without comment:

"We have it on the best authority that in 1866-67 the question arose, during a conference between the Canadian delegates and the Imperial authorities, what name should be given to the confederation of the provinces, and it was first proposed that it should be called 'The Kingdom of Canada'; but it is said that the Earl of Carnarvon, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, thought such a designation inadvisable, chiefly on the ground that it would be probably objectionable to the Government of the United States, which had so recently expressed its disapprobation of the attempt of the Emperor Napoleon to establish an imperial European dynasty in Mexico. . . . The Canadian delegates made due allowance for the delicacy of the sentiments of the Minister, and agreed, as a compromise, to the less ambitious title, 'Dominion of Canada'—a designation recalling that 'Old Dominion' named by Raleigh in honor of the Virgin Queen."

—Recent methods and progress in the study of palæography are illustrated in the brochure by T. W. Allen, entitled 'Notes on Abbreviations in Greek Manuscripts' (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan). It contains forty pages of explanatory matter and eleven pages of facsimiles, beautifully executed by photolithography. The examples are partly the result of a tour of research in France and Italy, but are mostly selected from manuscripts in the Bodleian and the British Museum. They supplement, and, to a certain extent, correct, the works of Gardthausen and Lehmann, being based on actual study of the originals, and not upon facsimiles, from which, as Graux and Vitelli have pointed out, it is impossible to arrive at trustworthy general conclusions. Highly interesting and curious is the series of forms presented for ἄρα, γάρ, εἶναι, and ἔσται, arranged to show their chronological development. Some new and valuable types are given of παρά and κατά, not found in Lehmann or Vitelli, and full examples of syllables beginning with τ. Explanations are offered of the genesis of the symbols for εἰς, οὖν, ὑπέρ, and ὑπό. A useful summary is added of the tachygraphic usage of the Grotta Ferrata school. San Nilo, the founder of this monastery, between Frascati and San Marino, on the lower slopes of the Alban Hills, established at the close of the tenth century a style of writing which persisted till the twelfth century, and the characteristics of which may be traced in some now widely scattered manuscripts. Some notes of special study of the Biblioteca Angelica at Rome are promised by Mr. Allen in the *Classical Review*. We learn, also, that he has just been appointed by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press to examine and report on the Greek MSS. in the various libraries of Europe.

ALBERT DÜRER.

Literary Remains of Albrecht Dürer. By William Martin Conway, sometime Roscoe Professor of Art in University College, Liverpool, Victoria University. With Transcripts from the British Museum Manuscripts, and Notes upon them, by Lina Eckenstein. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1889.

THIS book was well worth writing. Dürer is, unquestionably, one of the dozen great artists of modern times, yet of all the great artists that ever lived he is perhaps the least specifically artistic in temper. A man who became, not merely a painter, but one of the greatest of painters, yet of whom it may be said that the painter in him was the smallest part of him, is certainly worthy of careful study as a curiosity of human nature, if for nothing else. His artistic productions have been studied again and again, and are likely to be studied while the world lasts. This book is a most thorough and conscientious study of his writings. Every scrap of them that has been preserved to us seems to have been deciphered—letters and journals and notes written upon the margins of drawings, as well as his professed treatises upon art and engineering—and the whole collated and compared with scrupulous care in the effort to throw some new light upon his nature, his ideas, and his methods of work. The result is almost altogether admirable. Barring a certain singularity of style, especially in the opening chapters, we have no fault to find with it. The bulk of the book is made up of direct translation of Dürer himself, and what little archaism is here to be found gives only a pleasant old-time flavor to the language quite in harmony with the matter. Chapters iii. to ix. inclusive are almost entirely composed of Dürer's letters and journals, which are, apparently, given in full; the four later chapters deal with his published works, of which, of course, only extracts are given, and with his preparatory notes and studies for them.

Too great praise cannot be given to the industry with which this mass of material has been studied, or to the intelligence with which it is set forth. Painstaking reference is made in all cases to the whereabouts of the original manuscript, and abundant provision made for those who desire to consult it, and the translation is in many cases supplemented by a transcription of the original. Some idea of the kind and amount of labor involved may be formed from a note on the British Museum manuscripts on p. 168, part of which we quote:

"The leaves and bits of paper, it must be understood, are not arranged at all, either according to date, subject, or even size. The leaves which contain a single consecutive draft of one of Dürer's most interesting passages, and which should, of course, follow one another, are scattered through two volumes (iv. 68, 77, 76, and iii. 15). . . . Two other leaves, with sections of wide and narrow-angled church roofs, drawn doubtless originally on a single sheet of paper, side by side for comparison, are sundered by no fewer than a hundred leaves (iv. 147 and 45)."

This note may also serve as an instance of the scrupulous accuracy of reference which characterizes the volume. The result of it all is an aid to the study of Dürer, for the general public, second only to the engraved plates of the artist himself. And here we take leave of Mr. Conway, and devote the rest of our review to the singular genius he celebrates.

Albrecht Dürer was born on the 21st of May, 1471, and died on the 6th of April, 1528. His life therefore covered the flowering time of the Italian Renaissance, and he outlived Raphael eight years. Titian and Giorgione he may have known. On the other hand, we know that he met Quentin Matsys (who was about eleven years his senior) at Antwerp. With Holbein he represents about all there is of the Renaissance in Germany, but Holbein was his junior by twenty-four years. The mere names and dates show how slowly the Renaissance crept northward, but Dürer's work shows it better still. M. Édouard Fétis, in his Catalogue of the Royal Museum at Brussels, fixes the line of demarcation between the primitive schools and the modern more than a hundred years later in the north than in Italy, and places Holbein himself among the primitives. Whether or not he belongs in this category, Dürer certainly does, yet, in many ways, Dürer was the Renaissance incarnate.

His writings, as here arranged, show him to us successively from several points of view. First, we have the man Dürer, the burgher of Nürnberg, steady, hard-working, honest, careful of his pfennigs, sharp at a bargain, rather fretful and discontented in disposition, and a trifle vain, knowing his merit and not averse to speaking of it, a pious son, but a not particularly loving husband. His letters to Jacob Heller about the famous altar-piece he painted for him are almost comic in their insistent effort to screw an extra hundred florins from his unwilling patron. He returns to the charge again and again, tells him that he has used "none but the best colors he could get," and has "painted upon it more than twenty-four florins' worth of them." In another letter it becomes "twenty-five florins' worth of ultramarine" alone. He will never undertake such a job again for double the money, and even at the extra price he will be out of pocket by the bargain. Finally (and this is often repeated), he is already offered more for the picture than he asks, which, he goes on, "would have done very nicely for me had I not preferred to please and serve you by sending you the picture. For I value the keeping of your friendship at more than 100 florins. *I would also rather have this painting at Frankfurt than anywhere*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

else in all Germany." That that was the real point with him, is shown by his saying in another letter, "It will be seen by many artists who perhaps will let you know whether it is masterly or bad." One is glad to know that he got his money.

His father and mother he speaks of always with reverence and love, but he scarce ever mentions his wife, except to record occasionally, "I dined once with my wife," in that strange journal of his famous journey to Antwerp, in which he mingles accounts of the honors showered upon him with items of "4 pf. for bread," and near the end of which he makes the characteristic statement: "In all my doings, spendings, sales, and other dealings, in all my connections with high and low, I have suffered loss in the Netherlands."

Next we have Dürer as the religious reformer, and here there are some curious contrasts to be observed. We suspect, however, that Mr. Conway makes more of them than necessary. If Dürer, while still going to confession and praying to the "Mother of God," puts Popes and Cardinals among the damned in his illustrations of the Apocalypse, he does no more than did many mediæval artists whose Catholicism has never been questioned. His placing there also the Emperor and Empress shows what he meant—that the wicked, however high placed in this world, will have due punishment meted out to them in the world to come. Mediæval art and literature are full of ridicule of the vices and abuses of the clergy long before the *doctrines* of Romanism were questioned. Later, indeed, Dürer seems to have fallen much under the influence of Luther, and to have been deeply stirred by religious thought. There are passages in his writings which may fairly be called mystical, and others that seem to come from a religious zealot. Such is his famous apostrophe to Erasmus: "Oh, Erasmus of Rotterdam, where wilt thou stop? Behold how the wicked tyranny of worldly power, the might of darkness, prevails. Hear, thou knight of Christ! Ride on by the side of the Lord Jesus. Guard the truth. Attain the martyr's crown." Yet he was no gloomy fanatic, but, like Luther himself, loved *Wein, Weib, und Gesang.* His accounts contain frequent mention of money lost at play, and he freely jests with his friends about their mistresses. In fact, in his relations to religion, as in many other things, Dürer fully and fairly represented the Germany of his day, somewhat gross and materialistic in its pleasures, yet capable of serious thought and of deep emotion; clinging to the beliefs and outward forms of its old religion, yet determined to reform abuses and to rebel against Papal despotism. He was no longer a Roman Catholic, but he was hardly a Protestant.

If in his daily life and in his religion Dürer was the representative of the Germany of his day, in his wide curiosity, his thirst for new knowledge, the range of his learning and experiment, he was the representative of the Renaissance itself. Nothing in the way of information came amiss to his inquiring mind. He took a trip to Zeeland, apparently to see a stranded whale. He has left a careful drawing of a walrus. He scrupulously recorded all prodigies that came in his way or that he could hear of through friends. He was deeply interested in geometry, architecture, and music, was an inventor in fortification, thought much upon perspective without mastering its principles, and wrote treatises upon the measurement of the human figure. It is recorded that "Melanchthon used to say of him that, though he excelled in the art of painting, it was the least of his accomplishments," and, referring to a dispute between Dürer and Pirkheimer, he confessed, with a certain naïveté, "his astonishment at the ingenuity and power manifested by a painter in arguing with a man of Pirkheimer's renown."

The comparison with Leonardo da Vinci, that great contemporary of Dürer's who, more than any other man, represented the many-sidedness of the Renaissance, is here forced upon one. Of Leonardo, also, it might have been said by a contemporary, that painting "was the least of his accomplishments," though no contemporary was likely to express surprise at his "ingenuity and power" in argument. Leonardo also was musician, architect, engineer, and author. His celebrated letter to Sforza, in which painting is placed last among the things he could do "as well as any man," is well known. Leonardo also theorized upon the proper proportions of the human figure, and one of his drawings of a nude man drawn within a circle and a square seems to have been identical in idea with a couple of Dürer's. In this instance both drew their idea from Vitruvius. The resemblances between the two men were thus manifold, and it is interesting to know that the German may have come, indirectly, under the influence of the great Italian during his stay in Italy. Between them, however, there is a difference so wide that it alone is greater than the many resemblances. Leonardo was an Italian, with the Italian love for beauty, while Dürer was a German with the German reverence for fact!

Durer's theory on the measurement of the human body was peculiar and merits some attention. It was, briefly, that as every individual varies from the typical man in a way peculiar to himself, these peculiar variations will, in an infinite series of measurements, counteract and nullify each other, and the *type* will be disengaged. His ideal man was a sort of composite photograph of all existing men—the "average man" in the literal sense. It was not man "as he ought to be," as Raphael said he painted him, but man as he *is*, individual peculiarities excepted. The result of the theory is curiously shown in his measured drawings of the foot, in which elaborate diagrams are given for ascertaining the exact inward inclination of the great toe caused by the modern shoe! He was himself aware that his own observations were insufficient in number, and proposed his canon only as an approximation to the final one. In a draught for the introduction of that comprehensive work (never written) in which he intended to "Set down all that I have learned in practice, which is likely to be of use in painting," he says: "I do not highly extol the proportions I here set down, albeit I do not believe them to be the worst. Moreover, I do not lay them down as beyond improvement, but that thou mayest search out and discover some better method by their help."

But this temper of experiment did not last. He had an almost superstitious reverence for numbers and measurements as in themselves holy and beautiful, and he had the theorizing mind which must reduce everything to some system, however arbitrary. The sketched plan for his great work is like an old sermon with its divisions and subdivisions. It was to be in three divisions; each division was to be in three parts, and each of these was to be again divided into six smaller parts. The scheme was evidently made out with little regard to the contents and for the sake of its own symmetry, and it would have strained his ingenuity to fill out the frame he had made for himself. As an instance take Division III., Part B: "The second part shows how such a wonderful artist should charge highly for his art, and that no money is too much for it, seeing that it is divine and true; in six ways"! This theorizing and systematizing spirit lays hold upon his measurements, and we soon find ourselves in a nightmarish maze of geometrical rules for modifying all the proportions in the same degree by "Words of Difference," so as to produce thin or thick, short or long figures; of men "ten heads high," and similar monstrosities. Finally, in a letter to Pirkheimer about the preface to the 'Four Books of Human Proportions' which the latter had agreed to write, he is reduced to say: "I neither will nor can give any better reason for all the proportions set down in the whole book and in the sequel—why I make them so and not otherwise—save that in fact I do so make them."

Leonardo's strong sense of beauty saved him from the disastrous effects of such vagaries. Dürer's sense of beauty was slight, and when he was not dominated by his model he fell into woful error. Of one of his Madonna figures, Mr. Conway remarks: "*It* is not human. *It* is a painted theory; a colored proposition." But let Dürer the theorizer speculate as he might, Dürer the painter was a realist with a tenacious grip on facts. When constructing an "ideal" Virgin, he failed. Let us be thankful that, for the most part, his imitative instinct got the better of his idealizing mind, and that his life was spent in drawing the portraits of the very real men and women of his time.

We have said "Dürer the painter," but a painter, in the stricter sense, he never was. To paint is to represent upon a flat surface the visual aspects of things: Dürer's idea of painting was the delineation upon such a surface of all the ascertainable facts about things. A picture was a sort of geometrical projection of nature. To him effect was unknown, and mystery would have seemed falsification, light and shade was only a means of securing roundness, and color was only known as local color—an added fact about the object painted. This man, who was working in Venice while Giorgione was painting the Fondaco de' Tedeschi, was as a painter more primitive than Jan Van Eyck, and two-thirds of the art of painting was undreamed of by him. By early training he was a goldsmith, by choice an engraver, and the qualities on which he prided himself were exceeding minuteness in detail and an engraver-like sureness of hand. He is explicit about finish. "These things," he says, "should be wrought in the work to the clearest and carefullest finish, and even the tiniest wrinkles and details should not be omitted in so far as it is possible." He adds, to be sure, "though it is useless to overdo and overload a thing"; but it is said that it was impossible for him to finish a picture to his own satisfaction. With regard to his sureness of hand, there is an anecdote in Camararius's preface to his Latin translation of the 'Books of Human Proportions,' which is worth quoting entire for the light it throws upon Dürer and his methods:

"I cannot forbear to tell, in this place, the story of what happened between him and Giovanni Bellini. Bellini had the highest reputation as a painter at Venice, and, indeed, throughout all Italy. When Albrecht was there, he easily became intimate with him, and both artists naturally began to show one another specimens of their skill. Albrecht frankly admired and made much of all Bellini's works. Bellini also candidly expressed his admiration of various features of Albrecht's skill, and particularly the fineness and delicacy with which he drew hairs. It chanced one day that they were talking about art, and when their conversation was done, Bellini said: 'Will you be so kind, Albrecht, as to gratify a friend in a small matter?' 'You shall soon see,' says Al-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brecht, 'if you will ask of me anything I can do for you.' Then says Bellini: 'I want you to make me a present of one of the brushes with which you draw hairs.' Dürer at once produced several, just like other brushes, and, in fact, of the kind Bellini himself used, and told him to choose those he liked best, or to take them all if he would. But Bellini, thinking he was misunderstood, said: 'No, I don't mean these, but the ones with which you draw several hairs with one stroke; they must be rather spread out and more divided, otherwise in a long sweep such regularity of curvature and distance could not be preserved.' 'I use no other than these,' says Albrecht, 'and to prove it, you may watch me.' Then, taking up one of the same brushes, he drew some very long wavy tresses, such as women generally wear, in the most regular order and symmetry. Bellini looked on wondering, and afterwards confessed to many that no human being could have convinced him by report of the truth of that which he had seen with his own eyes."

Dürer was by nature and by training an engraver, and it was by engraving that he expressed himself most freely and fully, and it is on his engraved work that his reputation does and must mainly rest. But even in his chosen art the art itself was secondary to him. Art is good because it "is employed in the service of the Church," because it "preserveth the likeness of men after their death," because, "by aid of delineations, the measurements of the earth, the waters, and the stars are better to be understood; and many things likewise become known unto men by them." Art is with him an aid to devotion, a vehicle of thought, or a record of fact; but art for art's sake found no favor in his eyes. Pure beauty of line moved him little more than beauty of light and shade or color, but accuracy and expressiveness were everything to him. The accessories in his plates might serve to-day as working drawings for a cabinet-maker, so carefully is the construction made out, and in his landscapes every tree in twenty miles of country is plainly drawn. And as art was to him a vehicle of thought or a record of fact, so he could never pack enough thought or enough fact into a plate. Breadth, simplicity, concentration, the eliminating of many small facts to present some great fact more clearly—the suppression of all secondary ideas that the dominant idea may be more directly expressed—these things were quite foreign to his temper. Consider his two great plates, the "Melencolia" and the "Knight and Death," and remark how every corner, every quarter-inch of space, is crammed with meanings. He had so much to say, apparently, that he could not afford to waste any room. No quiet masses, as a relief to the eye, for him: no space is so small that some object may not be crowded into it which will add to the thought or at least to the realization of facts. And all these objects must be most clearly drawn and with the utmost minuteness. All the intricate detail of a tool or a mathematical instrument must be so marked that there can be no doubt about its use and structure. Nay, what is a pebbly bank but a collection of individual pebbles, each of which has its form as sacred as that of a mountain? An engraving, so treated, becomes a vast puzzle that one may pore over for hours, still finding something new to consider, and the drawing of a wrinkled old face is as intricate as the map of a continent.

All this is very far from the true artist's temper. It is rather the endless curiosity of the man of science or the deep pondering of the man of thought. What is it, then, that has placed among the immortals of art this man who was so little of an artist, so much of everything else? We believe it is his profound sympathy with the spirit of his age. With Dürer it is not so much his art which has preserved its contents as the contents which still interest us in his art. It is not so much Dürer's language that we care for (for that is very antiquated now), as it is his thought; and that thought interests because Dürer was, in his own person, his age and country embodied. His many-sided mind embraced every interest of his many-sided epoch, and he was, more than any of his contemporaries, the *representative man*. We have said that Dürer and Holbein were together almost all there was of the German Renaissance in art, but it might almost be said that Dürer *was* the German Renaissance. The art of Holbein is rather Dutch than German, and of many of the problems of his time he seems to have been serenely innocent. He was a wonderful portrait-painting animal, and went on painting superb portraits to the end, little worried by anything else; and, though the better painter, he was the smaller man. Dürer laid hold upon his age at all points, and therefore, for us, the Germany of the Renaissance and the Reformation, the Germany of Luther, Melanchthon, and Holbein is, above all, the Germany of Albrecht Dürer.

THE SCHOOLS OF EUROPE.

European Schools; or, What I Saw in the Schools of Germany, France, Austria, and Switzerland. By L. R. Klemm, Ph.D. [International Education Series. Vol. XII.] D. Appleton & Co. 1889.

WERE not the phrase too cheap, we should commend this volume as "a *very good* book." We may at least borrow the English form of eulogium, and say, "It is not half bad." "The book is written," as the author tells us in the preface, "for the purpose of offering a 'standard of measurement' for our own schools; a statement of what is done in the schools of Europe, and how it is done." This end is accomplished, not by tables of statistics and the exposition of school curricula, but by a multitude of concrete examples of methods and devices personally observed. The author visited some of the best schools in Europe, endeavored to see what was most excellent in those schools, and in clear and vigorous language reports what he saw without adding his own speculations. Or, rather, he takes us with him into the schoolroom, and we actually see for ourselves. Whether specially interested in common schools or not, we soon catch the enthusiasm of our guide; and, although he hurries from one thing to another with little order except that determined by geographical contiguity, and in spite of rhetorical commonplaces and the occasional use of newspaper Latin, criticism is disarmed, and this pedagogical excursion becomes thoroughly interesting and inspiring.

Naturally the larger part of the book is devoted to German schools. The author has no pedantic fear of criticising German methods, yet the "standard of measurement" here offered is unquestionably high. While in some things Germany is conservative, in most educational matters she is in advance of other nations. In the large cities not only are the schools admirably equipped and manned, but it is noteworthy that even the common schools "stand in close connection and intimate relation to the management of the Art Academy, the Art Museum, the Zoölogical and Botanical Garden, the Observatory, the libraries, the gymnastic societies, and even the theatre—in fact, with every institution which in some degree may be influential in assisting the work in school." Under the very shadow of Cologne Cathedral, in a city whose history antedates the Roman colony (Colonia Agrippina), from which it took its name, Dr. Klemm found liberal ideas and modern methods in the schoolroom. And even in country villages, where the children left their wooden shoes at the door of the school-house, he found professional teachers doing excellent work.

After showing the operation of the German schools, our author does not tarry for general comparisons and pedagogical moralizing, but leaves the reader to draw his own conclusions. What he wisely refrains from doing we have no intention of attempting; but it is worth while to note what appears again and again in this book and impresses one as the supreme excellence of German teaching, namely, the basing of methods of instruction and training upon psychological principles. In the first place, thorough work is done in the German schools. The teachers are not content to get an idea into a child's mind by one of the senses. They employ different senses, and, finally, make the pupil objectify the idea in action of some kind. For example, in a botany lesson each child brings a collection of leaves to the class-room; the teacher talks about the different varieties and sketches typical forms upon the blackboard; the children do the same, and, finally, they write out an account of the lesson. Likewise in other subjects, seeing and doing, hearing and telling, go hand in hand. This makes repetition possible, while breaking the monotony of review by varying its form.

In the second place, German teachers utilize the spontaneous interests of children, and attempt less to force the memory than to train the attention. The great device for arousing interest is objective teaching. Object-lessons, however, are made a means, not an end, and this form of instruction is not carried now to an extreme in Germany. The first craze for object-teaching Dr. Klemm describes as follows:

"There was a time in Germany when the principle of object-teaching electrified every schoolmaster from the Rhine to the Vistula, and from the Baltic to the Alps. It was thought that objective teaching was the panacea for all educational diseases. All order and system was abandoned, and objects were brought into the school-room till it looked like a pawn-broker's shop. No broken horseshoe was left lying in the street; old boots were eagerly gathered for the leather they yielded; no ant's hill was safe from the destructive hand that gathered ants' eggs; and the life of every snail innocently creeping across the road was imperilled. Everything was carried into school—animals, plants, and minerals. There the objects that would keep were neatly labelled, numbered, classified, and stored up. The children had good times then. The paper-boxes, moles' skeletons, minerals, stuffed birds, samples of wood, dried plants, and the like, went from hand to hand, and, to be sure, half a school day was often passed in contemplating the treasures of the museum; and the teacher quieted his conscience by thinking this to be an object-lesson."

To-day the fever has abated; and the reaction perhaps has gone to an extreme, for Dr. Klemm adds: "If the teacher needs a mineral, or an air-pump, or the Leyden-jars, he is obliged to give a week's notice to the janitor, so that he may search for the objects and make them presentable. . . . As the first wild craze was one extreme, this indifference is the other."

Moreover, the Herbartian principle, that "everything taught during a day, a week, a month, a year, should all be organically connected," shapes the methods in many German schools. Mr. Klemm found this well exemplified at the Francke Stiftungen, under the leadership of Dr. Frick, the distinguished exponent of Herbart's principles and Ziller's practice. In one of the grades, for example, all instruction centres about Robinson Crusoe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His experiences furnish the material for the language lessons; geography is taught by moulding maps in the sand and tracing Robinson's journeys; manual work consists of making pots, baskets, and the like, after the fashion of Robinson; arithmetic concerns the number of his sheep and goats; and even moral instruction is derived from Robinson's trials. Mr. Klemm does not take sides in the Herbartian controversy now raging in Germany; but, from the brilliant examples he gives, it is evident that this method of teaching in the hands of a competent teacher is a good one. At all events, the principle is sound that new knowledge should be "organically connected with previous cognitions."

Among the causes of the excellent results obtained in German schools are the use of the metric system in arithmetic, ample equipment of the schools, freedom from text-book slavery, stable tenure of office, and the professional training of the teachers, together with their lack of reverence for methods as such. But, after all, the best that can be said for German teachers is that they base education upon psychology. Methods of instruction vary; but from the elaborate devices of the Francke Stiftungen to the school for dullards at Elberfeld (where bright colors are the only things that interest the children at first, and where the school-room walls are left bare and dreary that the attention of the feeble-minded pupils may not be distracted), everywhere the principle is the same—the utilization of spontaneous interests and the development of voluntary attention.

The report of French schools is not as favorable, partly because Mr. Klemm visited Germany first and did not wish to repeat what had already been illustrated, partly because the French schools are inferior to the German. Many noteworthy things, however, are described. Especially the drawing and sketching done in French schools must strike American teachers as marvellous. Here, and throughout the book, the author uses his pencil freely, and proves what he says by reproducing specimens of pupils' work in drawing. A chapter devoted to Vienna, which vies with Leipzig in manual training, and another showing first the meagre education in the Swiss "people's schools" and then the excellent work done in the schools of Alsace, complete the volume.

While the author's manuscript is not starched into rhetorical accuracy, the facts reported are most helpful and suggestive, and the general freshness, clearness, and unconventionality of his style make the book thoroughly readable. If we had authority to name a work of recent date as "prescribed reading" for American teachers, we should recommend this one—for those who have visited European schools, that they might refresh their memories and note progress; for those who intend to visit Europe, that they might know where to go and what to see; and for those who must stay at home, because it is the best substitute for such a visit.

Around and About South America. Twenty Months of Quest and Query. By Frank Vincent. D. Appleton & Co. 1890. Pp. xxiv.-473.

THE three years which have passed since the close of Mr. Vincent's journeyings, recorded in this book, have made some parts of it belated. Three years mean many changes in South America, now that it has emerged from its Cathay cycles. The fulsome dedication of the work to Dom Pedro, and the rather Jenkins-like description of the Emperor in the body of the book, necessarily appear somewhat ludicrous after last November; and the author's rueful postscript to his preface, noting the great change, does not really help the matter much. What Mr. Vincent has to say about the Panama Canal (pp. 4–7, 460–462) would have to be considered pretty superficial in any case, and is made wholly valueless by the lapse of time since he wrote. Naturally, he has missed, too, the practical reconstruction of the Government of Peru, recently accomplished, so that his account of that country's political and financial outlook has lost all point. In Venezuela, also, the underpinning has fallen clean out from under the part of the book relating to that republic; the author falls in with the current adulation of that "illustrious American," Guzman Blanco, and knows nothing of the way the statues of that self-made hero have been tumbled from their pedestals, or of his complete repudiation by his country.

Passing all this by as perhaps an unavoidable misfortune connected with the preparation and publication of the book, and not insisting, as one might, not unreasonably, that it should have been brought down somewhat nearer to date, we find Mr. Vincent's work to be of considerable, though very unequal, value, and disappointing mainly because of his failure to make better use of his exceptional opportunities. He did the circumnavigation of the Southern Continent thoroughly, leaving the coast to visit the principal cities and to follow the travelled routes, and made some excursions far into the interior, which enable him to present matter of much interest and a good deal of novelty. We refer to his long trip up the Paraná to the falls of the Iguassu, and his various journeys into the heart of Brazil. The pages recording his experiences and observations while on this part of his travels are far the most valuable of the book, and, as they luckily number more than half of all, do much to redeem the rest. Even here it is not the author's method, but his material, that lends interest to his narration; throughout he follows the style of an itinerary, jotting down each day's doings by itself with the rigor of an unflinching diarist. When it is remembered that, making the large exceptions already noted, his eyes fell upon only the commoner and surface phenomena of the countries through which he hurried, it will be seen that much of his writing is of the slightest texture.

The great trouble with Mr. Vincent is that he is a mere traveller. He had no unifying aim or pursuit round which to group his scattered observations. He has not the temperament of a student; he tells us (p. 94) of a fine library containing 3,500 books and pamphlets, all about Bolivia, but not into one of them does he appear to have been tempted to peep. Not being a naturalist, an ethnologist, or a student of institutions, he is not drawn to make a thorough study of any one of the many departments of knowledge opened before him, and simply reflects the general views of the general traveller of general education. One can but contrast this method with that of the late Jules Crevaux, author of the sumptuous Hachette folio, 'Voyages dans l'Amérique du Sud.' The best of five years he gave up to exploration of the remote regions of Guiana, Venezuela, and Colombia, living with the Indians, studying their characteristics, making vocabularies of their languages, observing prodigal nature with the delight and success of a trained naturalist, always far from the ordinary routes, always laying himself close alongside the fact whose meaning he wished to extract. Beside such work as that, Mr. Vincent must seem amateurish in his steamboats, and railway cars, and diligences. Certainly he ran no risk of being killed, as Crevaux finally was, by venturing far up the Pilcomayo, into the haunts of dangerous tribes.

Several inaccuracies call for notice. Mr. Vincent gives the impression of having read various scientific books on his subject, but of having brought away confused ideas from them. On his very first page he settles a long-standing dispute off-hand, by assuring his readers that Columbus's San Salvador was Watling Island. This might be set down merely as due to the dogmatic spirit, were not the statement associated with it that Columbus beheld that part of the New World "thirty-five days from Spain." Our tourist did not go to the Galapagos Islands, but felt it incumbent to give a page or two to them, as he went steaming by eight hundred miles to the eastward. He seems to be aware of what Darwin had written about them, though he cites no authorities (nor does he anywhere in the whole book), but if so, his recollection is certainly most vague, and leads him to give a very jumbled account of what the master left perfectly clear. Some of his incidental remarks about the bearing of minor facts which fell under his observation on the great question of the Asiatic peopling of South America, equally bespeak an easy acquaintance with a very little science. It is, of course, a mistake to say that the llama is "the only native domesticated animal in South America" (p. 20). To speak of a dastardly attempt to assassinate President Caamaño of Ecuador as a "revolution" (p. 32), is doing too much honor to the score of conspirators who figured on that occasion. Making the Peruvian *sol* to be worth "about five cents" (p. 60) puts Mr. Vincent at variance with the Director of the United States Mint, who, in his report for 1888, made it 68 cents. We are still told of the United States of Colombia; since the reform of the Constitution in 1887–'88, the official title is the Republic of Colombia.

Mr. Vincent indulges in but few political reflections, and those few are enough to convince us of his wisdom in avoiding that sort of thing as a rule. It would be hard to put together in a single paragraph more mistakes in point of fact, and greater futility in point of reasoning, than may be found in the following:

> "The continued revolts and miniature revolutions of the disaffected South American States would soon become less frequent if stern and speedy retribution—such as death by hanging—should be administered to the leaders. But the authorities, instead, treat their distinguished prisoners to champagne and free them on parole. . . . The rebellions never result in any good. . . . The best remedy for these evils would be strong central governments, with sufficient power and inclination to preserve the peace and compel the observance of law and order."

Entirely baseless as well as ill-natured is the remark (p. 441), "The whole genius of the nation [Colombia] seems directed towards civil dissension and guerilla warfare." And Mr. Vincent is on decidedly dangerous ground when he speaks of "the demon of assassination always hovering over" South American Presidents. The retort open to a South American is too obvious, and Mr. Vincent would find it pretty hard to name a republic in South America where two Chief Magistrates had been assassinated within fifteen years.

We should be sorry if our dwelling upon serious defects, as they seem to us, were to result in an injustice to what is in many respects a pleasant and readable book. Its style is unusually simple and straightforward, the printing is remarkably accurate, and the two-score

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or more illustrations are refreshingly original for the most part. They are mostly process-work from photographs, and are excellent examples of that class of reproductions. Considered as an old-fashioned book of travels, the volume would have to be regarded as highly successful; it is only in comparison with the better modern methods of doing such writing that it fails.

The Political Problem. By Albert Stickney, author of 'Democratic Government,' etc. Harper & Bros. 1890.

A NEW class of literature relating to this country has arisen within the last ten years. Before that, hardly any writer ventured to come down later than the formation of our Constitution, or to do more than study reverently the motives and intentions of the framers of it. Now one writer after another—James Bryce, Woodrow Wilson, Prof. von Holst, the Duc de Noailles—sets himself to examine the practical and modern working not only of our Federal, but also of our local constitutions and governments. Mr. Albert Stickney now publishes his third work on these subjects, and this is the standard which he sets up, and by which, therefore, he may fairly expect to be judged:

"But if the 'civil-service reform' could be carried out to the letter, in its full length and breadth, it would be a mere drop in the bucket. The results would be too inconsiderable to deserve serious attention. It is wholly inadequate to meet the fundamental existing evils."

"I submit, then that the so-called Australian [ballot] system is fundamentally unsound in principle, is an attempt to deal only with surface symptoms, and should be put in the category of petty political panaceas."

Referring to the plan of giving administrative heads of departments seats in the popular assembly, he says:

"As an ingenious device for wasting human time and human strength, nothing can well be conceived more efficient than this favorite of literary politicians, the asking and answering of questions on the floor of the popular assembly."

As to urging good citizens to give more time to politics, to attend primary meetings and work out reform within the party, Mr. Stickney says:

"But this has often been tried in the past, and has always failed. It will certainly and always fail in the future unless we can find some way by which ordinary men who have to earn their living, can give all their time to politics and yet give all their time to the regular occupation by which they gain their bread."

Discussing the question of longer official terms, he objects to any fixed term, and sums up: "So that a longer term loses the assumed advantages, and keeps the actual disadvantages, of a term that is short."

What, then, are the grand yet simple ideas which are to throw all these weak expedients into the shade? In the first place, Mr. Stickney lays great stress upon the public meeting. He thinks that the citizens of small districts should meet and choose delegates to a larger meeting, which should discuss all subjects intelligently. That may be true, but is it new? Is it not exactly the principle of our present primary meetings, with the resultant of city council, State Legislature, and National Congress? Mr. Stickney's *bête noire*, however, is popular elections at fixed intervals. He thinks that the people have shown themselves unfit to exercise the right, and that men who can get themselves elected are quite unfit for anything else. His idea, therefore, is that a Legislature, having been elected once for all by the people—the actual incumbents would do as well as any others—should have its tenure made permanent, being affected only by death, resignation, or the act of the body itself. It makes one stare and gasp to hear it suggested that the members, say, of the Albany Legislature, would develop into a combination of Solon and Socrates if only their tenure of office could be changed to these conditions.

Passing to the Executive, Mr. Stickney thinks that only one administrative head should be elected, and all other officials be subordinate to him. He thinks, however, that, having been first selected by a popular assembly, elected *ad hoc* (we suppose, after the fashion of Presidential electors), the Executive should hold office till he either dies, or resigns, or is turned out by a two-thirds vote of the permanent Legislature, when his successor is to be elected by another popular assembly. Apparently there is an uneasy consciousness that a permanent Legislature and a permanent Executive would at once begin a course of corrupt intrigue, and that the Legislature, instead of turning a man out and running the risk of a popular election, would use its tremendous power to bend him to its purposes; for Mr. Stickney says: "The purchase of two-thirds of the delegates does not seem very probable if we can depend on the people to select men of integrity. And if we cannot depend upon the people to that extent, then we may as well throw up our hands and abandon the contest." We venture to suggest that perhaps he had better do that now. Suppose an official were to hold for twenty years and then be suddenly ejected by a two-thirds vote; how would a generation wholly unused to such work be set to choose an electoral college? But the working arrangements by which such tremendous changes are to be carried into effect are quite beneath the attention of this writer.

Feeling, again, that the utility of his plans has been hardly demonstrated with mathematical precision, Mr. Stickney urges, with an abundance of italics, that they would at least *have a tendency* to produce good results, that the citizens would have at all events an *opportunity* of choosing good men, and that there is certainly a *possibility* that they might do so. In other words, he wants to make Constitutional changes, compared with which the work of the French Assemblies of 1789–'93 was strictly conservative and in accordance with precedent, upon a bare chance that they would work well.

Perhaps the most curious feature is the argument by which he puts a keystone into a fabric perceived to be somewhat shaky: "Our present position is, that something must be *done*. Whoever objects to what is here proposed can fairly be called on to propose something better." It is the major premise that we should object to. Rather than accept such an alternative, we should say things had much better be left as they are for an indefinite period in the future.

Carlisle. By M. Creighton. [Historic Towns, edited by E. H. Freeman and W. Hunt.] Longmans. 1889. 8vo, pp. x, 215.

THIS volume contains an excellent account of the general history of Carlisle from the earliest times down to the present day. The first ten centuries of its history may be summed up in two or three short sentences. "A few coins, a few altars, and a few pieces of pottery are all that remain to tell us of Roman civilization in the Border town" (p. 14). "About the year 875 they (the Danes) overspread the western district, sacked and burned Caerluel, and left it scarcely inhabitable. For the next two centuries the once stately town, fortress, and monastery alike were laid low" (p. 21). Prof. Creighton's remark concerning Roman remains in Carlisle is true of almost all English towns. Though Carlisle, or Lugubalia, was an important Roman city, Roman civilization exerted no more influence upon its mediæval municipal development than that of other boroughs of England.

The relations of Carlisle to Scotland in the middle ages are interesting, and are clearly stated by the author. Chapter v. is devoted to an account of Border life, for "Carlisle owes its position among English towns not so much to the peculiar features of its own civic history as to the fact that it was the capital of the Borderland, and reflected the characteristics of the Border people" (p. 80). The last chapter gives a good account of the industrial growth of Carlisle from 1747 to 1881.

The weakest portion of the book is that which deals with the municipal history of the town. This is the vulnerable part of most of the volumes in this series; their value would have been greatly enhanced if the growth of municipal government had been more carefully investigated. We are informed that "the government of Carlisle was originally in the hands of the Merchant Guild"; that "the original civic body was the Merchant Guild" (pp. 120, 193). "When any corporate act had to be done by the burgesses, it was natural that the Guild brethren should do it in their behalf" (p. 40). The Gild often made itself "responsible for the amount of the town's payment," *i. e.*, the *firma burgi* (p. 40). This last statement is evidently borrowed from Stubbs's 'Constitutional History.' But it is untenable; the Gild Merchant as such had nothing to do with the payment of the fee-farm. Recent investigation has also shown that the Gild Merchant of English boroughs was not identical with the civic governing body, nor coextensive with the whole area of the civic administration. The author also speaks of a series of conflicts between this "aristocratic" Gild Merchant and the eight craft guilds of Carlisle, which resulted in a victory for the latter (pp. 90, 120, 193). The writer does not indicate his authorities for this and his other statements concerning the Gild Merchant; but they are doubtless taken from Ferguson's admirable works on Carlisle. Ferguson errs in exaggerating the influence of the Gild Merchant. This term was not commonly used in the struggle between the civic authorities and crafts of Carlisle. When used, it did not refer to the governing body of the town. The term "Gilda Mercatoria" was clearly applied to the aggregate of the eight crafts in 1681, and probably on other occasions (see Tremaine, 'Placita,' 525).

The author gives some curious data, on pp. 42, 43, concerning the *firma burgi* of Carlisle, so curious and abnormal that one feels inclined to test their correctness. The volumes of this series do not facilitate such tests; there are no footnotes giving the authorities upon which statements of fact are based. Prof. Creighton avoids the common mistake of confusing the annual fee-farm rent with a commutation of taxation or tollage. He clearly shows that *firma burgi* was the commutation of such royal dues as rents for burgage tenements, rents of mills, court perquisites, and the like.

Thiers. By Paul de Rémusat. Translated by Melville B. Anderson. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1889. ["Great French Writers" Series].

M. DE RÉMUSAT had a great opportunity and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has entirely missed it. His book on Thiers is a disappointment: he has omitted much that his readers had a right to expect, and he has put in much that no reader will care for. The life of Thiers is a fruitful and tempting subject, and should have been intrusted to more skilful hands. Thiers is himself an interesting and picturesque figure. He was the most brilliant example of that combination of the literary man and the statesman which forms such a striking feature in modern French history. Aside from the interest which attaches to him personally, he was a prominent actor in many of the most stirring events of one of the most stirring periods in the history of the world, and his name is indissolubly connected with the peace of 1871, a transaction almost unparalleled for the enormous concessions exacted by the victor and for the dramatic catastrophe of which it constituted a fitting sequel. Here, then, we have a man who at the age of twenty-six began the publication of a book that was, in its time, regarded as a great public event; who at the age of thirty-three took a prominent part in ousting one dynasty and installing another; who at the age of seventy-four saved his country from annihilation and brought order out of chaos; who for nearly half a century led a busy life as one of the most eminent writers, orators, and statesmen of his day; and, finally, of whom no adequate and authoritative biography has as yet appeared. What greater good fortune could befall any literary man than to be asked to prepare such a biography?

How M. de Rémusat has acquitted himself of the task will sufficiently appear when it is stated that of the personal history of Thiers he gives fewer details than can be found in the most meagre encyclopædia article; Vapereau's account is far more complete. Eight lines cover all that M. de Rémusat has to say about Thiers's birth, boyhood, and education; there is not a word about his parentage or domestic surroundings; the reader can go through the whole book without finding out whether Thiers was married or not, except that, incidentally, thirteen pages from the end, his wife is just mentioned; there is no bibliographical information at all about his two great works, their reception by the public, their translation into foreign languages, their relative rank in French literature according to the opinion of competent judges; some of the books he wrote are not even mentioned by name.

M. de Rémusat's whole method foredoomed his book to be a failure. The method he should have pursued was plainly marked out by his subject. In the first place, he was writing one of a series of literary monographs, and that in itself required that he should give to the literary side of Thiers as great a prominence as the facts permitted; secondly, there are certain well-defined divisions in the life of Thiers which almost predetermined the lines on which his biography should be laid out. There was, first, his career previous to his entrance on active political life; this should have embraced an account of his youth and schooling, of his beginnings as a journalist, the publication of his 'Revolution,' and the founding of the newspaper, *Le National*, in conjunction with Mignet and Armand Carrel. The second period extends from 1830 to 1840, when he took an important part in the Government of France, holding office with frequent interruptions, and finally giving way to his rival, Guizot, and returning to his literary pursuits. The third period would embrace the composition and publication of his 'Consulat et Empire,' with occasional participation in politics, and might extend to 1870. The fourth and closing period would recount his last years, and the signal service he rendered his distracted country at a time of life when most men think themselves entitled to rest on their laurels.

Instead of pursuing this obvious course, M. de Rémusat calls his chapters The Restoration, The July Government, The Third Republic, etc., as if he were writing a history of France, with incidental reference to Thiers, and treats us to page after page of superfluous disquisitions on politics which have no interest whatever, and no more connection with the career of Thiers than the Darwinian theory. For example, there is chapter iv., on The Empire from 1851 to 1863, in which, after some particularly flat observations on Napoleon III., the author naïvely tells us that "during the first epoch of the Empire Thiers took no part in politics." He might have told us that at once and spared us all the rest. A few pages further on he says that "Thiers's best diversion during these years was the completion of his 'History of the Consulate and the Empire.'" This is his first mention of the work, although twelve volumes of it had appeared before the *Coup d'État*. The manner of the book is no more fortunate than its matter; but perhaps that is the fault of the translator. If the translator has done any wrong to his author in this respect, he is still entitled to the gratitude of the reader for his elision of several superfluous passages, and would have done well if he had taken more such liberties with the text.

Modern Horsemanship: Three Schools of Riding. Original Method of Teaching the Art by Means of Pictures from Life. By Edward L. Anderson. Illustrated by forty moment photographs. A new edition, rewritten and rearranged. Pp. 164, xiii. Edinburgh: David Douglas; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1889.

It was a happy thought of Mr. Anderson to make use of instantaneous photographs as a means of conveying to the novice in horsemanship the simple but otherwise indescribable details of that art. This task he has well accomplished in this second edition of his excellent treatise. He is equally happy in his plan of giving a large part of the instruction which he seeks to impart in the form of instruction concerning the ways in which a horse should be broken to the saddle and trained to obey the will of the rider. No horseman ever attains a full measure of skill who has not successfully essayed this task of the instructor. In no other way can he become well acquainted with the peculiar limitations of the equine mind, or gain the sympathy with his horse which is the foundation of equestrian skill.

Mr. Anderson is perhaps the first of the writers on this subject to recognize the fact that systematic gymnastic training is necessary to fit the horse to do the peculiar and essentially unnatural tasks which the burthen and the behests of the rider impose upon him. He therefore gives considerable attention to the series of movements which seem to him desirable steps towards this end. This important part of the work might have been better accomplished if the exercises had been planned on a careful study of the internal anatomy of the horse. Though purely empirical, they rest on much experience and close observation, and therefore are likely to secure the desired result. These studies in equine gymnastics have the conspicuous merit that they point the way to better work in the same direction. If our author or any of his followers will use careful measurements to determine the effects of particular exercises in increasing the muscular development of horses, or the influence of such training in affecting the quality of their movements, we may secure a firm basis on which to found a rational system of educating these creatures for saddle use.

Among the many good, because eminently practical, points of this essay, we may commend Mr. Anderson's clear statements concerning the evils which arise from allowing a horse to form the habit of getting "behind the hand," and the careful directions concerning the process of leaping over an obstacle. Attention to these points will save the young horseman from the most serious dangers he may encounter from ill-trained horses or rough cross-country riding. By far the greater part of the mischances which befall fairly good horsemen arise from the one or the other of these conditions.

This work is intended for beginners, and is calculated to be of much service to them, but it would have been far more useful to such persons if pains had been taken to define the many terms which constitute the *argot* of the horse-trainer. As it is, the novice is sure to find trouble in deriving definitions from the context. In the next edition of the work (it deserves many) there should be a glossary of such terms, or each of them should be carefully explained in a foot-note. The volume is a handsome specimen of the book-maker's art; the print is admirable, the heliotype illustrations very good. There is, however, no index, and the table of contents is insufficient.

Latin Hymn-Writers and Their Hymns. By the late Samuel W. Duffield. Edited and completed by R. E. Thompson, D.D. Funk & Wagnalls.

Hymns, as produced under the action of devotional rather than literary motives, have but a doubtful literary standing. Those who write them, and in humbler degree those who collate or study them, find their reward in the edification of the Church; and the Church is seldom severely critical. Therefore hymnology is an obscure and little regarded field. The term, indeed, is dubiously and variously defined, and (in its more exact definition) the thing has come into being within the last generation or so. The Latin hymns present a partial exception, for such light as they contain shines through the darkness of a remote past, and several of them are admitted to be poetry. In the Middle Ages, literature was nothing if not theological; human powers, when not absorbed in statecraft, found their stimulus and vent in religion. Thus hymn-making received a share of attention from the best talents as well as the finest spirits. English hymnody, though it began so late and attracted a narrower circle, is far more voluminous; in part because education was more general and the printing-press at hand, in part because the chaff has not yet had time to be thoroughly sifted from the wheat. Of this latter the materials are much greater than is usually supposed. Taking the two together, none but a bold man would attempt to be the chronicler of both.

This boldness Mr. Duffield possessed. Tempted from his true path by the supposed comparative smoothness, brevity, and popularity of one nearer at hand, he bestowed two years' leisure on a subject to which slower and less ambitious students had given their lives, and produced in 1886 a stout octavo on 'English Hymns, their Authors, and History.' As the largest and most pretentious of American publications on this topic, it was accepted by some as an authority. But it contained many blunders and little original research; it freely "con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

veyed" the labors and occasionally the language of predecessors (eminently the late Josiah Miller), who were seldom mentioned except to point out their defects and errors, real or imaginary; the tone even towards hymn-writers was in some cases needlessly carping, as when Mrs. Rowe was twice accused of having "jilted" Dr. Watts—a thing the good woman neither did nor dreamed of; there was too much assumption of being first in a field wherein Mr. Duffield was in reality a late comer, and of having mastered an array of facts with which he was but imperfectly acquainted.

This posthumous book is another affair. With the Latin writers Mr. Duffield was on ground which he had made his own; there was no need to depend on the labors of others, and then to disguise the fact. The subject-matter, being in a "dead" language, may claim a certain historic dignity; credit for some learning could be won, and the attention invited of scholars who care nothing for hymns in the vernacular. In this narrower range of more recondite and picturesque material the author had made real studies of his own, and the result is that his chapters are both pleasanter and more instructive reading than those on Watts, Wesley, and their followers. Some minor writers, the Breviaries, etc., which Mr. Duffield failed to handle, have been dealt with in a careful and competent, if less vivacious, manner, by his editor, who is responsible for full a third of the book.

The Life of Richard Steele: By George A. Aitken. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889.

THESE two handsome volumes, with several admirable portraits, are the fruits of a long and laborious study of Steele's life, largely from original and untouched sources, and the narrative consequently gathers up all that has hitherto been known and adds much to our previous information. The author's work has been directed necessarily to detail; he has sifted and verified with untiring industry; and if to have made a full and faithful account of Steele and all his family, and to have thrown light on imperfectly known though not intrinsically important transactions, is success, he is rewarded. Steele's life has been written in the form of literary sketches, with some imaginative filling-up, several times; but there has been no attempt at a standard and complete biography like this. The principal addition to the old matter consists of some minor but interesting discoveries, such as the name of his first wife, the widow from Barbados, which was Margaret Stretch, and the clue thus afforded leads to a disentanglement of his business affairs with regard to the Barbados property; and, secondly, the thorough search which the author has made of court records, spreads before us the details of those business troubles which perpetually harassed the too generous and profuse writer. Such subjects occupy a large portion of the volumes; but the literary relations of Steele, his differences with Swift, his obligations, real or unreal, to Harley, his entire political and theatrical career, are not neglected; everything is included that could possibly come within the interest of the reader, and among the rest particularly noticeable is a better account of his acquaintance with Berkeley. The matter, however, is mainly matter of fact rather than of literature. The reputation of Steele is not really affected, as a writer, by anything in the volumes. The gain lies rather in our possession of a solid basis of fact for our estimate of the man, such as to make antiquated both Thackeray's and Macaulay's delineations of his personality. The calmer view of Forster is the one sustained by the evidence, and though Steele still appears as a much troubled man, he comes out with credit and with his old attractions of generosity, humanity, and humbleness undiminished.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Adams, W. D. Rambles in Book Land: Short Essays on Literary Subjects. A. C. Armstrong & Son. $1.25.
American Whist Illustrated. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.75.
Baker, Mary M. Ruby Dana: A Novel. John B. Alden.
Balg, G. H. Comparative Glossary of the Gothic Language, with especial reference to English and German. Part IX. and last. New York: B. Westermann & Co.
Banker's Almanac and Register for 1890. Homans Publishing Co.
Barns, C. E. A Portrait in Crimson. Welch, Fracker Co.
Bates, Arlo. Albrecht. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.
Bellamy, E. Six to One. New ed. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 35 cents.
B. F. Stevens's Facsimiles of MSS. in European Archives relating to America, 1773–1783. Vols. I., II. London: B. F. Stevens.
Black, W. Prince Fortunatus. Harper & Bros.
Souvenir of "The Dead Heart." Cassell & Co. 40 cents.
Spurgeon, Rev. C. H. Around the Wicket Gate. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 75 cents.
Stanley, Maude. Clubs for Working Girls. Macmillan & Co. $2.
Stanton, W. H. The Morgue of the Wage-Earners. Scranton, Pa.: W. H. Stanton.
Story, W. W. Conversations in a Studio. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $2.50.
The Converted Catholic. Vol. IV. James A. O'Connor. $1.50.
The Critic. Vol. XII. New York: The Critic Co.
The Exegesis of Life. Minerva Pub. Co. 50 cents.
The Splendid Spur. Cassell & Co. 50 cents. Also, Harper & Bros.
Turnbull, Mrs. L. The Catholic Man: A Study. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.25.
Veitch, Sophie F. F. The Dean's Daughter. D. Appleton & Co. 50 cents.
Verne, J. A Family without a Name. F. F. Lovell & Co. 30 cents.
Vernes, M. Les Résultats de l'Exégèse Biblique. Paris: E. Leroux.
Verrall, A. W. The Agamemnon of Æschylus. Macmillan & Co. $3.00.
Vicars, E. S. The Young Queen, and Other Stories. London: Geo. Bell & Sons.
Vincent, F. Around and About South America; Twenty Months of Quest and Query. D. Appleton & Co. $5.
Washburn, W. T. Spring and Summer, or Blushing Hours: Poems. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.25.
Wagner, Lieut. A. L. The Campaign of Königgrätz. Fort Leavenworth, Kans.
Walpole, S. Life of Lord John Russell. 2 vols. Longmans, Green & Co. $12.
Walter, J. Shakspere's True Life. Longmans, Green & Co. $5.
Warden, Florence. Nurse Revel's Mistake. Frank F. Lovell & Co. 30 cents.
Westbrook, Mary. Rachel Du Mont: A Brave Little Maid of the Revolution. 4th ed. Albany: Joel Munsell's Sons. $1.50.
Wheeler, J. M. Biographical Dictionary of Freethinkers of all Ages and Nations. London: Progressive Publishing Co.
Wilde, Henriette. Schiller Immortalen: Ein Geburtstagsbuch. Philadelphia: I. Kohler. $1.
Wilson, W. The State and Federal Governments of the U. S.: A Brief Manual for Schools and Colleges. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 55 cents.
Winship, A. E. The Shop. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. 60 cents.
Wright, W. H. K. The Fables of John Gay. Frederick Warne & Co. 75 cents.
Wright, Rev. J. H. The Patience of Hope, and Other Sermons. Funk & Wagnalls. $1.25.
Yexter, W. J. Luck in Disguise. John W. Lovell Co. 50 cents.
Young, Arthur. Travels in France. Scribner & Welford. $1.40.
Young, Prof. C. A. Elements of Astronomy. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Zuhof, R. I. Viera: A Romance. Thos. Y. Crowell & Co. $1.50.

"Every child in America should have them."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia' should be in every juvenile library."—*From a Report of the Connecticut Board of Education.*

YOUNG FOLKS' CYCLOPÆDIA of { *Common Things...$2.50.* / *Persons and Places.$2.50*

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers, New York.

MENTAL INVALIDS OF A MILD type, especially those afflicted with Melancholia, sufferers from abuse of alcohol, and victims of the opium habit are offered superior advantages in private treatment and care at the STOCKTON SANITARIUM, in the beautiful village of Merchantville, N. J., five miles by train from foot of Market St., Philadelphia. Absolutely no suggestion of an asylum. The spacious, veranda-surrounded houses in the outskirts of the village, with their twelve acres of grove, garden, and lawn, are precisely like the better class of private country villas. The utmost freedom consistent with security is allowed. Pleasant surroundings, open-air exercise, country drives, cheerfulness, comfort, quiet. These conditions are *demonstrated* by experience to have marked effect on curable cases, and they contribute largely to the comfort of confirmed cases who here find a home, combined with the safeguards of skilled attendance. The proprietor (who was for 20 years in charge of Male Department of Pennsylvania Hospital for Insane) refers to many eminent alienists. Illustrated Circulars by mail. Address, DR. S. PRESTON JONES, Merchantville, N. J.

HENRY VAN KLEECK,
Successor to Bishop, Gorham & Van Kleeck,
DENVER, COLORADO.
INVESTMENTS AND LOANS.
Money loaned on real estate security, interest collected, investments made and managed for Eastern investors in Colorado and the West.
Reference—James M. McLean, Pres. Man. Life Ins. Co., New York; Edward C. Perkins, Boston; W. S. Jackson, Colorado Springs, and the Banks of Denver.

DAVIS' DIAMOND HAMS.
CINCINNATI.
Read Circulars How to Cook Them.

WHY waste time and means in devising ways to stop fires, when it is in your power to prevent them? The terrible bereavement that has come to the household of Secretary Tracy is only another instance of the lack of prevention. Why use inflammable paints, when Pyrodene Paint, produced in all colors, can be applied at no greater cost than lead, and its covering capacity 30 per cent. more?

The awful calamity that has come upon Secretary Tracy's family moves every one to ask what is to prevent a like calamity in any household in the land. Only a few can build fire-proof houses to live in. Hardly anybody ever does build such houses. On the contrary, the fashion is to build with the greatest amount of woodwork, and oil, and varnish, so that when the flames get hold of the structure they spread with the utmost rapidity. In this case it appears that the house servants, or some of them, were about their work while the fire was licking up the polished wainscotting of the parlor and stairway, all unmindful of what was going on, and that when they perceived the fire it was too late to save the lives of those who were still sleeping. Slow-burning construction has been applied to factories without much addition to their cost. Ought not this calamity to teach the guild of architects how to apply slow-burning construction to private houses? If it does not have that effect, it will be a costly lesson that brings no return. —*The Nation, February 6.*

Pyrodene Liquid, non-poisonous and containing no deleterious substance as silicate of soda, first applied to the woodwork prevents dry rot, and then painted over with Pyrodene Paint, and the two combined render the same perfectly uninflammable. Save your property and lives from destruction by painting your houses with Pyrodene Liquid and Paint, manufactured and for sale by the American Aquol and Pyrodene Paint Co., 422, 424, 426 West 15th St., New York City, where testimonials can be obtained and tests shown to prove its efficacy. Call and examine.

CATALOGUES ISSUED of Books in good condition. Books purchased.
E. W. JOHNSON, 1336 Broadway.

The Ethical Record.
A QUARTERLY.

CONTENTS OF JANUARY NUMBER.
The Idea of Justice in Plato's "Republic"—PAUL SHOREY, Ph.D.
The Ethics of Divorce.—Prof. FELIX ADLER.
A School of Economics.—Hon. CARROLL D. WRIGHT.
Ethics in Yale University.—Prof. GEORGE T. LADD.
Ethical Teaching at the University of Pennsylvania. Prof. GEORGE STUART FULLERTON.
Teaching of the History of Religions.—JEAN RÉVILLE.
The New Interest in Ethics.—Prof. W. KAWELIN.
A Critique of "Ethical Religion."—THOMAS DAVIDSON. Reply by Mr. SALTER.
Autumn Festival of the Workingman's School. General Notes.

Yearly Subscription, $1.00. Single Number, 30 cents.
Address
THE ETHICAL RECORD,
405 NORTH 33D STREET.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell Bills of Exchange on and make cable transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies, also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travelling credits, available in all parts of the world.
Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers.
NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

BOOKS IN THE FOREIGN AND ANCIENT LANGUAGES. Subscription to foreign periodicals, Tauchnitz British Authors. Catalogues on application. CARL SCHOENHOF, 144 Tremont St., Boston.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED